

AN ENTIRE NEW WORK.

CHURCH, STATE, LAW, AND REPRESENTATION.

Re-written, newly arranged, and corrected throughout from the latest Official Returns, BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR, and complete in One Volume, 8vo. 14s. in black cloth, with a characteristic Frontispiece.

The Extraordinary Black Book,

comprising the United Church of England and Ireland, the Civil List, and Hereditary Revenues of the Crown; Incomes, Influence, and Privileges of the Aristocracy; Diplomatic and Consular Establishments; Law and Courts of Law; Revenue and Colonial Abuses; the Debt and Funding System; Bank and East India Company, with Thoughts on Renewal of their respective Charters; the Representation, with the Prospects of Reform under the New Ministry; also, correct Lists of Pluralists, Pensioners, Placemen, Sinecurists: presenting a complete View of the Cost, Influence, Patronage, and Abuses of Government in Church, State, Law, and Representation.

THE BLACK BOOK usually called the "*Reformer's Bible*," has been often reprinted, but never corrected since its first publication in 1820; it is now offered to the public, as an entirely New Work, and at two-thirds of the price of former editions.

Published by EFFINGHAM WILSON, Royal Exchange.







"'Twas your zealous want of sense, and sanctified impertinence ;
Obliged the State to talk about, and turn you root & branch all out."

THE
EXTRAORDINARY
Black Book:

AN EXPOSITION OF THE
UNITED CHURCH
OF
ENGLAND AND IRELAND;
CIVIL LIST AND CROWN REVENUES;
INCOMES, PRIVILEGES, AND POWER,
OF THE
ARISTOCRACY;

PRIVY COUNCIL, DIPLOMATIC, AND CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS;
Law and Judicial Administration;

REPRESENTATION AND PROSPECTS OF REFORM
UNDER THE NEW MINISTRY;

Profits, Influence, and Monopoly

OF THE
BANK OF ENGLAND AND EAST-INDIA COMPANY,

With Strictures on the
RENEWAL OF THEIR CHARTERS;

DEBT AND FUNDING SYSTEM;

Salaries, Fees, and Emoluments in Courts of Justice, Public Offices, and Colonies;

LISTS OF

Pluralists, Placemen, Pensioners, and Sinecurists:

THE WHOLE CORRECTED FROM THE LATEST OFFICIAL RETURNS, AND PRESENTING
A COMPLETE VIEW OF THE EXPENDITURE, PATRONAGE, INFLUENCE, AND
ABUSES OF THE GOVERNMENT, IN

Church, State, Law, and Representation.

BY THE ORIGINAL EDITOR.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

1831.

Entered at Stationers' Hall.

LONDON :
MARCHANT, PRINTER, INGRAM-COURT.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE *Black Book* was, originally, brought out in periodical numbers, and laboured under the disadvantages incident to that mode of publication: the composition was hurried, the subjects ill-arranged and digested, and time was not always afforded for verifying facts and obtaining complete and authentic information. Defective as the publication was, it excited unusual interest; though rough in manner, and incorrect in matter, it contained a striking development of Oligarchical abuse, and thus fixed the attention of the public. It has been oftentimes reprinted, and upwards of 14,000 copies have been sold, almost without the expense of advertisement, or any of those helps from literary notices which are usually deemed essential to give celebrity to the productions of the press.

The imperfections of the original undertaking, augmented by intervening changes, have been comprised in the editions of the work hitherto published; with the exception of eight pages, not a single subject has been revised, nor an alteration made, further than in the title page. It has now been so completely re-modelled by the original Editor, that it may be said to be newly-created. The price has been reduced one-third; all that was valuable in the two volumes of the old work has been carefully corrected, and a variety of new subjects has been introduced; it has been composed entirely afresh, newly arranged, and is, in all respects, a new Book.

The opinions and statements now submitted to the public are those alone for which the Editor feels responsible. Ten years have elapsed since the first publication; in the interval, all things have changed, or nearly so—but the writer is the same. His object at first was, and now has been, to show the mani-

fold abuses of an unjust and oppressive system ; to show how it has ruined the country, and by what ramifications of influence it has been supported.

Government is a corporation and has the same interests and the same principles of action as monopolists. It is supported by other corporations ; the Church is one, the Agriculturists another, the Boroughs a third, the East-India Company a fourth, and the Bank a fifth : all these, and interests like these, constitute the citadel and out-works of its strength, and the first object of each is to shun investigation. We have, however, rent the vail ; those who before doubted may, if they please, come and see, and be convinced.

All the parliamentary returns of this and preceding sessions, whatever could throw light on the ecclesiastical establishments, the civil list and hereditary revenues, the courts of law and judicial administration, the aristocracy, public offices, funding system, public revenue, pensions, sinecures, and other departments of our work have been consulted. Our object has been an honest one, and we have sought to attain it by honest means : nothing has been exaggerated, nor has a single fact been wilfully misstated ; we needed not the aid of falsehood, our case being strong enough without it, and we refer to the evidence of our pages to attest the veracity of our sources of intelligence. The task has been a laborious one, but it is finished and we hope the public will have the benefit of it.

Only one more explanation is necessary. The first hundred pages were printed in the spring of 1830 ; the great events of the month of July intervened, and the ministry has been changed while the work has been passing through the press. We mention this to account for facts and allusions in various parts of the publication. While occupied in our labours we could not help catching the spirit of the day, and reverting to the extraordinary scenes almost hourly occurring.

Feb. 1st, 1831.

DEDICATION TO THE PEOPLE.

To the People our labours may be fitly inscribed—they are the tribunal of last resort,—also the victims of misrule,—and to them, therefore, may be properly dedicated a record of the abuses from which they have long suffered, and of the means by which they may be alleviated.

All the blessings the nation ought to enjoy have been intercepted,—the rewards of industry, science, and virtue have been dissipated in iniquitous wars abroad—at home, in useless establishments, in Oligarchical luxury, folly, and profusion.

If we wanted proof of misgovernment—of incapacity and turpitude—Ireland affords a frightful example: it is not Mr. O'Connell who causes her agitation; he is only one of the fruits of Tyranny,—an effect, not the cause, of the disorders, which have originated in the neglect of her vast resources, in an unemployed population, an absentee proprietary, and a plundering church. To the wretchedness of Ireland, England is fast approaching, and just as little from the efforts of individual disturbers. It is not the manufacturing, but the agricultural districts which are now excited; these have always formed the exclusive domain of

the Clergy and Aristocracy;—the rural population is exactly what tithes, game-laws, the country magistracy, Church-of-Englandism, and a luxurious and non-resident priesthood have made them. And what do we behold? The people have risen against their pastors and landlords, and have resorted to nightly outrage and revenge—the last resort of the oppressed for wrongs for which neither remedy nor inquiry has been vouchsafed.

We are not of the number of those who inculcate patient submission to undeserved oppression. A favourite toast of Dr. Johnson was, “Success to an insurrection of the Blacks.” Shall we say—Success to the rising of the WHITES! We should at once answer yes, did we not think some measures would be speedily adopted to mitigate the bitter privations and avert the further degradation of the labouring classes.

A new era, we are told, is about to commence:—no more libticide wars—no more squanderings of the produce of industry in sinecures and pensions—and, above all, reform is to be conceded. We wait in patience. Our diseases are manifold and require many remedies, but the last is the initiative of all the rest, involving at once the destruction of partial interests—of monopolies, corn-laws, judicial abuse, unequal taxation,—and giving full weight and expression to the general weal and intelligence. If Ministers are honest, they deserve and will require all the support the People can give them to overturn a system which is the reverse: if they are not, they will be soon passed under the ban of their predecessors, with the additional infamy of having deceived by pledges which they never meant to redeem. We have hope, but no confidence.

Public opinion, and not Parliament, is *omnipotent*; it is that which has effected all the good which has been accomplished, and it is that alone which must effect the remainder. Unfortunately, Government can never be better constituted than it is for the profit of those who share in its administration; they have no interest *in change*, and their great maxims of rule are,—first, to concede nothing, so long as it can with *safety* be refused; secondly, to concede as little as possible; and, lastly, only to concede that little when every pretext for delay and postponement has been exhausted. Such are the arcana of those from whom reform is to proceed, and it is unnecessary to suggest the watchfulness, unanimity, and demonstrations by which they must be opposed.

Some of the Ministers are honest—they are all ingenious, and, no doubt, will have an ingenious plan, with many ingenious argument for its support, concocted for our acceptance,—a plan with many convolutions, cycles, and epicycles—and, perhaps, endeavour to substitute the shadow for the substance! But it will avail them nothing; the balance is deranged, and it must be adjusted by a real increase of democratic power. The remedy, too, must be one of *immediate* action, not of *gradual* incorporation; it must not be patch-work—no disfranchising of non-resident voters—the transfer of the right of voting to great towns—the lessening of election expenses—and stuff of that sort. Such tinkering will not merit discussion, and would leave the grievance precisely in its original state.

We have fully stated our views on the subject in the concluding article of our work: our chief points are the Ballot;

the entire abolition of all existing rights of suffrage ; the substitution of an uniform elective qualification ; the shortening of the duration of Parliaments ; and the number of representatives returned by each town or district to be proportioned to the number of electors.

These conditions granted, a real reform would be obtained, and all good would follow in their train. Our last wishes are, that the PEOPLE, to whom we dedicate our labours, will be firm—united—and persevering, and, rely upon it, we are on the eve of as great a social regeneration as the destruction of feudality, the abasement of Popery, or any other of the memorable epochs which have signalized the progress of nations.

February 1st, 1831.

CONTENTS.

ADVERTISEMENT.....	Page iii
DEDICATION TO THE PEOPLE	v

• CHAPTER I.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

INTRODUCTION:—Conduct of public men in respect of religious institutions	1
England—the only country to which ecclesiastical reform has not extended	4
The un-Christian conduct of the clergy—supporters of aristocratic wars—not favourable to education—not given to charity—and communicate little useful knowledge to the people	6
I. ORIGIN AND TENURE OF CHURCH PROPERTY.....	9
Origin and fourfold division of tithes	10
Effect of the new disposition of ecclesiastical property at the Reformation	12
Church property proved to be public property from legislative acts	15
Tenure of the clergy—same as other public functionaries.....	16
Clergy, tenants-at-will, may be ejected by their parliamentary landlords	17

II. PATRONAGE OF THE CHURCH.

Dr. Lushington's error in considering advowsons private property	17
Evasion of the laws against simony	18
Jews and Infidels may select persons for the gospel ministry	19
Patronage divided among the bishops, the king, aristocracy, and gentry	19
Circumstances which have recommended the present bishops to promotion	21
Examples of perversion of patronage by bishops Sparke, Sutton, and Pretymen	22
Clerical monopoly illustrated by examples	25
Number of the clergy and number of preferments shared among them	26
Singular division of parochial benefices into pluralities	27
More than one-third of incumbents pluralists	28

III.—SINECURISM.—NON-RESIDENCE.— PLURALITIES.—
CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Duties of the several orders of clergy	29
Discoveries of Mr. Wright on church discipline	30
Pretexts of the clergy for non-residence	34
Parsons' indemnity bill	35
Primate Sutton's mode of church government	37

IV. REVENUES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

Suggestions for obtaining an authentic return of ecclesiastic revenues	38
Examples of increase in value of church property	39
Quarterly Review's estimate of church revenues examined	41
Estimate of value of sees from authentic data	43
Lectureships, public charities, surplice fees, and other sources of clerical income	44
Statement of church revenues, from tithe, church fees, &c.	48
Intire revenues of the church monopolized by 7694 individuals	49
Bishops, dignitaries, and aristocratic pluralists, chiefly engross church income	51

CONTENTS.

xi

Church of England without poor clergy, unless it be curates	52
Proportion in which revenues are divided among the several orders of clergy	54
Comparative cost of church of England and other churches	58

V. RAPACITY OF THE CLERGY EXEMPLIFIED.

Conduct of the rich clergy in respect of first fruits	61
Rapacious claims of the London clergy	63
True policy of the church expounded	67

VI. LITURGY OF THE CHURCH.

Opposite conduct of Whigs and Tories in respect of religion	69
Defects in the book of Common Prayer	70
Church Catechism	71
Strange mode of ordaining priests	72

VII. WHO WOULD BE BENEFITED BY ECCLESIASTICAL REFORM ?

Not meant tithes should be abolished, but commuted for an equivalent assessment on landlords	74
Opinions of Lord Brougham, Burke, Watson, and Paley, on tithes	75
Rights of lay-impropriators examined	77
Ought compensation to be allowed for church patronage ?	77
Necessity of religious worship of some kind	78
Conclusion of church of England	80

CHAPTER II.

CHURCH OF IRELAND.

Ireland, an illustration of oligarchical government	81
Presents a more revolting spectacle of ecclesiastical abuse than England	82
Extent of acres appertaining to the Irish sees	84
Wealth bequeathed to their families by the bishops	85
Injurious tendency of Act for composition of tithes	86

Pluralities, unions, and extent of benefices	87
Statement of sums to be paid in lieu of tithes in several parishes, the names of incumbents and patrons	90
Estimate of the revenues of the Protestant establishment.....	95
Number of clergy among whom the revenues are divided	96
Constitution of the deans and collegiate chapters	96
Eight hundred and fifty individuals possess 3195 ecclesiastical offices.....	98
Tabular statement of church patronage	99
Non-residence of bishops and parochial clergy	100
Oppressiveness of the tithe system illustrated	102
Proportion of roman catholics and protestants	105
Management of the first fruits fund	107
Intolerance of the church towards dissenters and catholics	110
General conclusions on the united church of England and Ireland	112

CHAPTER III.

REVENUES OF THE CROWN.

Delusion practised in respect of the crown revenues	118
Origin and history of the crown lands	120
Shameful abuses in the management of the landed revenues	122
Amount and appropriation of landed revenues	126
Expenditure on Regent-street, Charing-cross improvements, Wind- sor Castle, &c.	126
Official statement of income and expenditure of landed revenues ..	128
Establishment for management of crown lands	130
Estimate of the value of crown lands	131
Sale of them recommended	132
Droits of the crown and admiralty	133
Origin of and examples of application of produce of admiralty droits	133
Four-and-a-half per cent. Leeward Island duties	138
Expended in parliamentary jobbing—Burke's pension	139
Curious expedient of late ministers for raising a jobbing fund	141
West-India church establishment	141
Scotch hereditary revenues	143

Gibraltar duties — duchies of Cornwall — escheats — fines — and penalties	144
Statement of produce of hereditary revenues of the crown	145

CHAPTER IV.

CIVIL LIST.

Lavish settlement of civil list in preceding reigns.....	147
King's household — its Gothic origin — and expensive establishment	148
Departments of the lord chamberlain, lord steward, and master of the horse	149
Origin of the privy-purse and court pension-fund	151
Enumeration of the classes and charges on the civil list	153
Civil list allowance augmented a quarter of a million in 1820	158
Items in civil list expenditure which ought to be curtailed	160
Total personal charge of a king of England.....	161
Civil list contingencies	163
Royal debts and expenditure during the two last reigns	165
Charges for the younger branches of the royal family.....	167
Total expenditure from accession of Geo. III. to the death of Geo. IV. one hundred millions	168
Policy and character of the two late reigns	173
Peculiar death of Geo. IV. and his chief counsellors	177
General conclusions on the crown revenues and civil list	177

CHAPTER V.

PRIVY COUNCIL—DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS—AND
CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS.

Number and constitution of the king's privy council	180
Sir James Graham's motion on the emoluments of privy counsellors	181
Ambassadors and diplomatic missions	183
Consular establishments	188
Official returns relative to foreign ministers and consuls	193

CHAPTER VI.

THE ARISTOCRACY.

Triumphs of knowledge over the privileged orders	196
Clergy, lords, and commons deviated from original object of their institution	198
Tendency of right of primogeniture and entails	200
Objectionable privileges of the peerage	202
Aristocratic taxation exemplified	204
Incomes of landed interest, the legitimate fund for taxation	206
Specimen of partial exemptions from taxes	207
Aristocratic game-laws—their tyrannical and injurious tendency ..	209
Incomes of the aristocracy	212
Diminutive income of the Peerage compared with that of other classes	214
Different classes of society and their respective incomes	216
Taxes levied on the industrious orders	218
Increase of the peerage	219
More prolific than other classes of the community	220
Absurdity of hereditary legislation	221
Sources of aristocratic monopoly and abuse	222

CHAPTER VII.

STATE OF THE REPRESENTATION.

Sir R. Peel's argument on Parliamentary Reform	225
Anomalies in the elective franchise	225
Answer to the argument that men of ability are returned to the commons under the existing system	226
Calamities of the country resulted from non-representation	227
Causes of the popularity of the revolutionary war	227
Comparison of the English and French constitution	228
Lord Castlereagh's description of the house of commons	230
Changes in the constitution of parliament	231

List of places which formerly sent members to parliament	232
Table of the duration of parliaments in each reign	233
Shires and boroughs represented in different reigns	234
Alphabetical list of cities and boroughs, showing the elective qualification in each—the number of electors—and names of patrons	235
Representation in Scotland and Ireland	244
Summary of parliamentary patronage	246
Prospects of reform in the representation	246, 551

CHAPTER VIII.

LAW AND COURTS OF LAW.

Boasted independence of the judges considered	249
Confused state of statute and common law	250
Judges do not understand the law, though the people are expected to comprehend it	251
Dunning's mode of expounding acts of parliament	252
A lawyer's library described	253
Causes of the multiplication of statutes	255
Obscure language in which they are drawn—example from Peel's acts	256
Hodge-podge acts—blunder in the forgery act of sir J. Scarlett ..	257
Legislation, an after-dinner amusement of the house of commons ..	258
Number and emoluments of the professional classes	259
Debtor laws the chief source of litigation and emoluments to legalists	261
Courts of request, &c. encourage a vicious system of credit	263

Summary of legal abuses and defects :

Objections against a stipendiary magistracy	265
Different laws in different places	266
Different laws for different persons	267
Absurdities of fines and recoveries	269
Defects in agreements for leases and conveyances	270
Arrest for debt—its injustice	271
Inconsistent liabilities of property for debt	272

Insecurity of titles to estates	274
Inconsistences of the marriage-laws	275
Monstrous costs of law-suits	275
Law of debtor and creditor	277
List of absurdities in judicial administration	278
Real cause of no reform in the court of chancery	280
Oppressions under the excise-laws	281
Prospects of legal reform	286
Official returns illustrative of law and courts of law	290

CHAPTER IX.

PROGRESS OF THE PUBLIC DEBT AND TAXES.

Effects of taxes on wages and profits	294
Objects of the parliamentary wars waged since 1688	295
Short view of each reign, from the accession of William III.	296
Increase of debt and taxes consequent on each war since the revolution	297
Cost of war against independence of United States of America ..	298
Cost of the French war from 1793 to 1815	300
Conclusions on disastrous policy of the Borough-government	302

CHAPTER X.

EXPOSITION OF THE FUNDING-SYSTEM.

Feudal system had one advantage	303
Stocks, exchequer-bills, and navy-bills	305
Progress and state of the Debt, to the year 1830	306
Annual charge entailed on the country by the war of 1793	308
Plans for redemption of the debt	309
Dead-weight-annuity project	316
New suggestions for liquidating the Debt	318
Catastrophe of the funding-system	320
Obligation imposed to keep faith with public creditors	321
Severe distress consequent of an attack on the funds	322
A violation of national faith perpetuate the power of the Oligarchy	323
The last resort of the Aristocracy	325

CHAPTER XI.

ABUSES IN THE REVENUE-DEPARTMENT.

Exchequer most absurd and lucrative of government-offices	328
Audit-office	330
Civil department of the army	330
Civil department of the navy—royal dock-yards	331
Increase of peace-establishments	332
Expenditure of the Colonies—utility of	335
Losses sustained by the colonial system.....	336
The slave-trade	337
Expenses of civil government	338
Lord-lieutenancy of Ireland	338
Expenses of a coronation—absurdity of the pageant	339
Taxes on newspapers, and their influence on the press.....	340
Monopoly of the press, and mode of influencing it	341
Dangerous irresponsible power of “ The Times ”.....	343
Advantages from cheap political pamphlets	345
Knowledge the great instrument of social improvement	348

CHAPTER XII.

THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

Bank and East India Company outworks of the Borough-system..	350
Origin and progress of the Company	351
Territorial acquisitions and Indian wars.....	356
Exploits of the Duke of Wellington in India	359
Government and patronage of India	360
Territorial revenues and commerce of India	367
People of England pay the Company's dividend in the monopoly price of tea	369
Thoughts on the renewal of the Company's charter.....	372
The real point of interest between the Company and the people stated	375
Extravagant expenditure of Company and necessity of retrench- ment	376

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

Mistaken views of political economists	377
Origin and progress of the Bank	378
Issue notes of a low denomination	380
Bank-restriction-act	381
Resumption of cash-payments in 1823	383
Irresponsible power of the Bank over the circulation	384
Sources of Bank profits, and their enormous amount	387
Bank hanged and transported 800 persons, and realized a profit of 300 per cent.	389
Exclusive privileges of the Bank	390
Directors have not acted on sound principles of banking	390
Statement of their affairs	391

CHAPTER XIV.

PLACES, PENSIONS, SINECURES, REVERSIONS, HALF-PAY, AND SUPERANNUATIONS.

Salaries and number of persons employed in the public offices....	393
One million per annum might be saved by reductions in salaries ..	394
Civil and military pluralities	395
Half-pay and superannuations	396
Sinecures, reversions, and pensions	398
Pension-roll amounts to £777,556 per annum	401
Infamous pension-act of 57 Geo. III.	402
Unjust principle of granting compensations	403
List of "high and efficient public men"	404
Pensions to ex-lord-chancellors	405
Compensation and retired allowances	405
Salaries and pensions exceeding £1000	408
Classification of 965 placemen, receiving £2,161,927 per annum..	410

CONTENTS.

xix

List of forty-two placemen whose incomes exceeded £339,809	411
General statement of annual expenditure of the country in salaries, pensions, sinecures, &c.	412
Principles on which government has been carried on by late admi- nistrations	413

CHAPTER XV.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF PLACEMEN, PENSIONERS, SINECU- RISTS, AND GRANTEES	415
Addenda to Place and Pension list	499

CHAPTER XVI.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF BISHOPS, DIGNITARIES, AND PLU- RALISTS	502
--	-----

APPENDIX.

1. Valuation of sees and dignities in the King's Book	535
2. Irish pluralists	539
3. Parishes which have compounded for tithes in Ireland	540
4. Civil-list expenditure in lord-steward's department	541
5. Expenditure in department of robes	542
6. Expenditure of master of the horse	543
7. Application of money paid from the hereditary revenues	544
8. Number of public annuitants, and amount of their dividends..	545
9. Assessment and expenditure on account of the New Police..	546
10. Return of number of Metropolitan Police and divisions	548
11. Returns of the half-pay and retired allowances of the army and navy	549

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM UNDER THE NEW MINISTRY.

New prospects of reform—Question discussed, by whom ought the elective franchise to be exercised, and in what manner, whether by open or secret suffrage ?	551
Comparison of French and English constituency	552
Disadvantages peculiar to England	553
The pocket, or close boroughs	553
Ought compensation to be given to the Boroughmongers ?	554
Corporation boroughs	555
Open boroughs	556
All those classes of boroughs alike objectionable, and ought to be disfranchised	558
What ought to be the elective qualification	560
Practical operation of principle of Universal Suffrage examined ..	561
Necessity of union among the industrious orders against the Church and Aristocracy	562
The Ballot—supported by reason and opposed only by sentiment ..	563
Chief points which Parliamentary Reform ought to include	564
Suggestion for making representation co-extensive with taxation ..	565
Conclusion—Analysis of House of Commons, elected in 1830 ..	565

THE
Extraordinary Black Book ;
OR,
PUBLIC ABUSES UNVEILED.

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

RELIGION and the pursuits of science and commerce have greatly benefited the human race. Christianity is peculiarly the worship of the people : among them it originated, and to the promotion of their welfare its precepts are especially directed. Under the influence of its dogmas the pride of man is rebuked, the prejudices of birth annihilated, and the equal claim to honour and enjoyment of the whole family of mankind impartially admitted.

Men of liberal principles have sometimes shown themselves hostile to the Gospel ; forgetting, apparently, that it has been the handmaid of civilization, and that for a long time it mitigated, and, finally, greatly aided in breaking the yoke of feudality. They are shocked at the corruptions of the popular faith, and hastily confound its genuine principles with the intolerance of Bigotry, the oppression of tithes, the ostentation of prelacy, and the *delicts* of its inferior agents, who pervert a humble and consoling dispensation into an engine of mere gain and worldliness. In spite, however, of these adulterations, the most careless observer cannot deny the generally beneficial influence of the Christian doctrine, in promoting decorum, and a spirit of peace, charity, and universal benevolence.

As education becomes more diffused, the ancillary power of the best of creeds will become less essential to the well-being of society. Religions have mostly had their origin in our depravity and ignorance ; they have been the devices of man's primitive legislators, who sought, by the creations of the imagination, to control the violence of his passions, and satisfy an urgent curiosity concerning the phenomena by which he is

surrounded. But the progress of science and sound morals renders superfluous the arts of illusion; inventions, which are suited only to the nursery, or an imperfect civilization, are superseded; and men, submitting to the guidance of reason instead of fear, the dominion of truth, unmixed with error, is established on the ruins of priestcraft.

Even now may be remarked the advance of society towards a more dignified and rational organization. The infallibility of popes, the divine right of kings, and the privileges of aristocracy, have lost their influence and authority: they once formed a sort of secular religion, and were among the many delusions by which mankind have been plundered and enslaved. Superstition, too, is gradually fading away by shades; and it is not improbable it may entirely vanish, ceasing to be an object of interest, further than as a singular trait in the moral history of the species. Formerly, all sects were bigots, ready to torture and destroy their fellow-creatures in the vain effort to enforce uniformity of belief; now, the fervour of all is so far attenuated, as to admit not only of dissent, but equality of claim to civil immunities. The next dilution in pious zeal is obvious. Universal toleration is the germ of indifference; and this last the forerunner of an entire oblivion of spiritual faith. Such appears the natural death of ecclesiastical power; it need not to be hastened by the rude and premature assaults of Infidelity, which only shock existing prejudices, without producing conviction: while the priesthood continue to aid the civil magistrate, their authority will be respected; but when, from the diffusion of science, new motives for the practice of virtue and the maintenance of social institutions are generally established, the utility of their functions will cease to be recognized.

Sensible men of all ages have treated with respect the established worship of the people. If so unfortunate as to disbelieve in its divine origin, they at least classed it among the useful institutions necessary to restrain the passions of the multitude. This was the predominant wisdom of the Roman government. Speaking of this great empire, in its most triumphant exaltation, GIBBON says, "The policy of the emperors and the senate, as far as it concerned religion, was happily seconded by the reflections of the enlightened, and by the habits of the superstitious part of their subjects. The various modes of worship which prevailed in the known world were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful. And thus toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord."* Further on he continues, "Notwithstanding the fashionable irreligion which prevailed in the age of the Antonnines, both the interests of priests and the credulity of the people were sufficiently respected. In their writings and conversation, the philosopher asserted the independent dignity of reason; but they resigned their actions to the command of law and custom. Viewing with a smile of pity the various errors of the vulgar, they diligently

* Decline and Fall, vol. i. p. 46.

practised the ceremonies of their fathers, devoutly frequented the temple of the gods, and, sometimes condescending to act a part on the theatre of superstition, they concealed the sentiments of the atheist under the sacerdotal robes. Reasoners of such a temper were scarcely inclined to wrangle about their respective modes of faith or of worship. It was indifferent to them what shape the folly of the multitude might choose to assume; and they approached with the same inward contempt and the same external reverence the altars of the Libyan, the Olympian, or the Capitoline Jupiter."

Can it be supposed the statesmen and teachers of the nineteenth century are less adroit and sagacious than those of pagan Rome? Can it be supposed those whose minds have been enlightened by foreign travel, who have witnessed the conflict of opposite creeds, and who have escaped the mental bondage of cloisters and colleges in the freedom of general intercourse are less penetrating than the magnates of the ancient world? Like them too they will be equally politic in maintaining an outward respect for the errors of the vulgar. In the prevailing worship they recognize an useful auxiliary to civil government; prosecuting no one for dissent it can as little offend the philosopher as politician; and the topics of all-absorbing interest it holds forth to every class, diverts the vast majority from too intense a contemplation of sublunary misfortunes, or from the painful contrast of their privations with the usurpations and advantages of their superiors.

The policy of governing nations by enlightening the *few* and hoodwinking the *many* is of very old standing. It is strongly inculcated by Machiavel in his *Prince*, and Dugald Stewart remarks, that public men of the present day mostly hold the *double-doctrine*;* that is, they have one set of principles which they openly profess in complacence to the multitude, and another, comprising their real sentiments, that they keep to themselves, or confide to intimate friends. The result of this sinister policy may be constantly remarked in the proceedings of legislative assemblies; in the discussion of questions bearing on the social interests, especially such as involve the principles of government, the theory of morals, or population, there is invariably maintained a conventional latitude, beyond which if any one trespass, it is deemed more creditable to his sincerity than understanding. It is only the vain and superficial who unreservedly assail popular opinions, and prophane with invective and ribaldry the sanctities of religion. Such rash controversialists are ignorant of the *points d'appui* upon which the welfare and harmony of society depend; and though it may happen that honour, philanthropy, or patriotism be sufficient guarantees for the discharge of social duties by some, there are others whose turpitude can only be restrained by the fear of Tyburn or Tartarus. Hence theological inquiries have lost much of their interest, and are, in fact, placed beyond the pale of discussion. The mysteries of religion are well understood by the intelligent of all classes; it is considered for the good of society

* Supplement to Ency. Britannica.

that some should "believe and tremble," while others enjoy, in private, the consciousness of superior light; and to those who impugn and to those who dogmatise in matters of faith the same indulgence is extended as to well-meaning disputants who utter, as new discoveries, commonplace or self-evident truths.

Having made these general observations on the utility of religion, considered as a civil institution for the government of mankind during a period of ignorance, we shall proceed to our more immediate object—an exposition of the Established Church of this country.

In our elucidations of this important inquiry, it is not our intention to interfere with the doctrines of the national religion. We have heard there are more than one hundred different sects of Christians: so it would be highly presumptuous in mere laymen to decide which of these multifarious modes of worship is most consonant to the Scripture. A certain Protestant Archbishop said, "Popery was only a religion of *knaves* and *fools*;" therefore, let us hope the Church of England, to which the Right Reverend Prelate belonged, comprises the honest and enlightened. The main purpose of our inquiries is not the dogmas but the temporalities of the Church. To us the great possessions of the clergy have long appeared an immense *waste*, which wanted surveying and enclosing, if not by act of parliament by the act of the people. Like some of our political institutions the excellence of our religious establishment has been greatly over-rated; it has been described as the most perfect in Europe; yet we are acquainted with none in which abuses are more prevalent, in which there is so little real piety, and in which the support of public worship is so vexatious and oppressive to the community.

Most countries on the Continent have reformed their church establishments: wherever a large property had accumulated in the hands of the clergy, such property has been applied to the service of the nation; and we are now the only people who have a large mass of ecclesiastical wealth appropriated to the maintenance of an indolent and luxurious priesthood. Even in papal Rome the church property has been sold to pay the national debt; so that far more property belonging to the clergy is to be found in any part of England of equal extent than in the Roman state. The cardinals of Rome, the bishops, canons, abbots, and abbesses, have no longer princely revenues. A cardinal who formerly had thousands has now only *four* or *five hundred* pounds a year. Residence is strictly enforced, and no such thing as *pluralities* are known; the new proprietors of the Church estates live on them and improve them to the best advantage. In France, there has been a still greater ecclesiastical reformation. Before the Revolution the clergy formed one-fifty-second part of the population. The total number of ecclesiastics, in 1789, was estimated at 460,000, and their revenues at £7,400,000. At present, the total number of clergymen, Protestant and Catholic, is about 36,000, and their total income £1,100,000. Throughout Germany and Italy there have been great reforms in spiritual matters; the property of the church has been sold or taxed for the

use of the state, and the enormous incomes of the *higher* have been more equally shared among the *lower* order of the clergy. In the Netherlands, the charges for religion, which supply the wants of the whole community, except those of a few Jews, do not, in the whole, exceed £252,000, or 10d. per head per annum, for a population of six millions.* Even in Spain, under the most weak and bigotted government, ecclesiastical reform has made progress. A large portion of the produce of tithe is annually appropriated to the exigencies of the State, and the policy adopted of late has dispossessed the clergy of their wealth; and this body, formerly so influential, is now lightly esteemed, and very moderately endowed.

Wherever these reforms have been made, they have been productive of the most beneficial effects; they have been favourable to religion and morality, to the real interests of the people, and even to the interests of the great body of the clergy themselves; they have broken the power of an order of men at all times cruel and tyrannical, at all times opposed to reform, to the progress of knowledge, and the most salutary ameliorations; they have diffused a spirit of toleration among all classes, removed the restrictions imposed by selfish bigotry, and opened an impartial career to virtue and talent in all orders; they have spread plenty in the land by unfettering the efforts of capital and industry, paid the debts of nations, and converted the idle and vicious into useful citizens. Wherever these changes have been introduced they have been gratefully received by the People, and well they might; for, with such changes, their happiness is identified, liberty and intelligence diffused.

To England, however, the spirit of ecclesiastical improvement has not yet extended; though usually foremost in reform, we are now behind all nations in our ecclesiastical establishment; though the Church of England is ostentatiously styled the *reformed* Church, it is, in truth, the most *unreformed* of all the churches. Popery, in temporal matters at least, is a more reformed religion than Church of Englandism. There is no state, however debased by superstition, where the clergy enjoy such prodigious wealth. The revenues of our priesthood exceed the revenues of either Austria or Prussia. We complain of the poor-rates, of superannuation charges, of the army and navy, of overgrown salaries and enormous sinecures; but what are all these abuses, grievous as they are, to the abuses in our church establishment, to the sinecure wealth of the bishops, dignitaries, and aristocratical rectors and vicars? It is said, and we believe truly, that the clergymen of the Church of England and Ireland receive, in the year, more money than all the rest of the Christian world put together. Our national clergy cost, at least, eight times more than the national clergy of France, while, in France, there are 30,000,000 of Catholics; whereas, of the 24,000,000 of people, comprising the population of our islands,

* Foreign Quarterly Review, No. X. p. 394.

less than *one-third*, or 8,000,000, are hearers of the Established Religion.

Such a system it is not possible can endure. While reform and reduction are in progress in other departments, it is not likely the clergy should remain in undisturbed enjoyment of their possessions. To protect them from inquiry, they have neither prescriptive right nor good works to plead. As a body they have not, latterly, at least, been remarkable for their *learning*, nor some of them for exalted notions of *morality*. It would be unfair to judge any class from individual examples; but it is impossible to open the newspapers without being struck by the repeated details of clerical delinquency. When there is an instance of magisterial oppression, or flagrant offence, it is almost surprising if some father in God, some very reverend dean, or some other reverend and holy person, be not accused or suspected. In this respect they resemble the clergy of the Church of Rome before the Reformation. It is known that the catholic priesthood in the fourteenth century exceeded all other classes in the licentiousness of their lives, their oppression, and rapacity; it is known, too, that their vices arose from the immense wealth they enjoyed, and that this wealth was the ultimate cause of their downfall.

It is not to the credit of the established clergy, that their names have been associated with the most disastrous measures in the history of the country. To the latest period of the first war against American independence they were, next to George III. its most obstinate supporters; out of the twenty-six English Bishops, Shipley was the only prelate who voted against the war-faction.* To the commencement and protracted duration of the French revolutionary war, they were mainly instrumental; till they sounded the ecclesiastical drum in every parish, there was no disposition to hostilities on the part of the people; it was only by the unfounded alarms they disseminated, respecting the security of property and social institutions, the contest was made popular. In this, too, the episcopal bench was pre-eminent. Watson was the only bishop who ventured to raise his voice against the French crusade, and he, finding his opposition to the court fixed him in the poorest see in the kingdom, in the latter part of his life appeared to waver in his integrity. In supporting measures for restraining the freedom of discussion, and for interdicting to different sects of religionists a free participation in civil immunities, they have chiefly been foremost.

Public education is a subject that appears to have peculiar claims on the attention of the clergy; unless indeed, as instructors of the people, their functions are extremely unimportant, and certainly, in this world, do not entitle them to much remuneration. Yet this is a duty they have generally neglected. Had not a jealousy of the Dissenters roused them into activity, neither the Bell nor Lancaster plans of instruction would have been encouraged by them. A similar feeling appears to have ac-

* Belsham's History of Great Britain, vol. x. p. 349.

tuated them in the foundation of King's College, in which their object is not so much the diffusion of knowledge, as the maintenance of their influence, by setting up a rival establishment to the London University. In short, they have generally manifested either indifference or open hostility to the enlightenment of the people, and, in numerous instances of eleemosynary endowments, they have appropriated to their own use the funds bequeathed for popular tuition.

A feeling of charity is the great beauty of Christianity; it is, indeed, the essence of all virtue, for, if real, it imports a sympathy with the privations of others divested of selfish considerations. The rich and prosperous do not need this commiseration; if they are not happy, it is their own fault, resulting from their artificial desires and ill-regulated passions. But the poor, without the means of comfortable subsistence, have scarcely a chance of happiness, though equally entitled with others to share in the enjoyments of life. It is the especial duty of the clergy to mitigate extreme inequalities in the lot of their fellow-creatures. Yet it is seldom their labours are directed to so truly a Christian object; though wallowing in wealth, a large portion of which is the produce of funds originally intended for the destitute and unfortunate, they manifest little sympathy in human wretchedness. As a proof of their ordinary callousness, it may be instanced that, at the numerous public meetings to relieve the severe distress of the Irish, in 1822, not a single Irish bishop attended, when it was notorious the immense sums abstracted by that class from the general produce of the country had been a prominent cause of the miseries of the people.

The clergy might be usefully employed in explaining to popular conviction the causes of the privations of the people, and in enforcing principles more conducive to their comfort and independence. In the agricultural districts, where their authority is least disputed, and where the sufferings of the inhabitants are greatest, such a course might be pursued under peculiar advantages. Their remissness in this respect is less excusable, since they are relieved from cares which formerly engaged anxious attention. In the time of Hoadley, Barrow, and Tillotson, much of the zeal and talent of the church were consumed in theological controversy: the removal of civil disqualifications has tended to assuage the fervour of ecclesiastical disputation, and the clergy have only tithes, not dogmas, to defend. This tendency to religious tranquillity has been also promoted by the indifference of the people, who discovered that little fruit was to be reaped from polemical disquisitions, which, like the researches of metaphysicians, tended to perplex rather than enlighten. Men now base their religion on the *rock of faith*, which they inherit from their parents, and mostly hold through life, whether sectarian or orthodox. Amidst this general peace, it seems incumbent on the clergy to open new sources of utility, which, as the endowed servants of the public, they are bound to cultivate. They are our *pastors*, (the shepherd's crook they are sometimes pictured with being the symbol,) and in the double capacity

of guardians and guides, are bound to conduct us to temporal as well as spiritual happiness.

It is the inefficiency of the clergy as public teachers, the hurtful influence they have exerted on national affairs, and their inertness in the promotion of measures of general utility, that induce men to begrudge the immense revenue expended in their support, and dispose them to a reform in our ecclesiastical establishment. To the Church of England, in the *abstract*, we have no weighty objection to offer; and should be sorry to see her spiritual functions superseded by those of any other sect by which she is surrounded. Our dislike originates in her extreme oppressiveness on the people, and her unjust dealings towards the most deserving members of her own communion. To the enormous amount of her temporalities, and abuses in their administration, we particularly demur. It is unseemly, we think, and inconsistent with the very principles and purposes of Christianity, to contemplate lofty prelates with £20,000 or £40,000 a-year, elevated on thrones, living sumptuously in splendid palaces, attended by swarms of menials, gorgeously attired, and of priests to wait upon their persons, emulating the proudest nobles, and even taking precedence of them in all the follies of heraldry. Beneath them are crowds of sinecure dignitaries and incumbents, richly provided with worldly goods, the wealthiest not even obliged to reside among their flocks; and those who reside not compelled to do any one act of duty beyond providing and paying a miserable deputy just enough to keep him from starving. Contrasted with the preceding, is a vast body of poor laborious ministers, doing all the work, and receiving less than the pay of a common bricklayer or Irish hodman: but the whole assemblage, both rich and poor, paid so as to be a perpetual burthen upon the people, and to wage, of necessity, a ceaseless strife with those whom they ought to comfort, cherish, and instruct.

These are part of the abuses to which we object, and which we are about to expose; and as we intend our exposition to be complete, it may be proper to state the order in which the several subjects will be treated.

First, we shall inquire into the origin and tenure of Church-property, clearly showing that Church-property is public property, originally intended and now available to public uses.

Secondly, we shall inquire into the tenure of patronial immunities; exhibit the present state of Church-patronage, and show, by examples, its abuses and perversion to political and family interests.

Thirdly, we shall expose the system of Pluralities, Non-residence, and other abuses in Church Discipline.

Fourthly, we shall treat on the enormous Revenues of the Established Clergy, from tithes, church-lands, surplice-fees, public charities, Easter-offerings, rents of pews, and other sources.

Fifthly, we shall detail some extraordinary examples of Clerical Rapacity, exemplified in the conduct of the higher clergy, in regard

to Queen Ann's Bounty, and of the Clergy generally, as regards First Fruits, Moduses, and Tithes in London.

Sixthly, we shall advert to a few inconsistencies and improprieties in the Liturgy of the Church.

Seventhly, we shall inquire—Who would be benefited by a Reform in the Church Establishment?

Lastly, in the Appendix, we shall give a Statement of the Incomes of the Bishoprics and principal Dignities, and an Alphabetical List of the Pluralists in England and Wales, showing the number of livings and other preferments held by each individual, the names of their patrons, their family connexions, and influence.

A full exposition of these several topics will hardly leave any thing further to be desired in respect of the Church Establishment. First, then, of the

ORIGIN AND TENURE OF CHURCH PROPERTY.

A late dignitary of the church, the Rev. Dr. Cove, in his "*Essay on the Revenues of the Church of England*," inclines to the idea that the consecration of a tenth part to the clergy was the consequence of "some unrecorded revelation made to Adam;" which, he says, is not only "a most rational, but the most probable solution" of the origin of tithes. To what parish church Adam paid his tithe, this zealous partizan of the establishment has left unascertained: if Adam paid tithe, he must have paid it to himself, or a very near relation,—a practice which, if tolerated to his descendants, would render them less averse to the impost, though it might be far from advantageous to the church establishment.

The only people who can pretend to place the right to tithe on divine authority are the Jews; but such a right, if it ever existed among them, certainly ceased with their theocracy. The Jews of this day pay no tithes for the support of their rabbies; nor, indeed, have any tithes been paid by this nation since the destruction of the Temple and consequent dispersion of the tribe of Levi.

It is so inconsistent with reason, that it may be almost affirmed to be an unquestionable fact, that there never was a religion, either Jew or Gentile, that could legally claim for its maintenance a tenth part of the yearly produce of land and labour. For the clergy to be entitled to a tenth, they ought to form one-tenth of the population; but there never was a mode of worship which required one-tenth of the people to be teachers and ministers. The tribe of Levi had a tenth, because they formed a tenth of the population, and had no other inheritance; but Aaron and his sons had only a tenth of that tenth; so that the clergy received no more than the *hundredth part*, the remainder being for other uses, for the rest of the Levites, for the poor, the stranger, the widow, the orphan, and the temple.

Christianity contains less authority for tithe than Judaism. Jesus Christ ordained no such burden; and in no part of his history is any compulsory provision for the maintenance of the clergy mentioned. Both

our Saviour and his Apostles unceasingly taught poverty and humility to their followers, and contempt of worldly goods. Hear their exhortations: "Carry neither scrip nor shoes; into whatever house ye enter, say, Peace." "Take no care of what ye shall eat, nor what ye shall drink, nor for your bodies what ye shall put on." "Beware of covetousness; seek not what ye shall eat, but seek the kingdom of God." "Give alms; provide yourself with bags that wax not old, a treasure in Heaven that faileth not." Again, "Distribute unto the poor, and seek treasures in Heaven." And, again, "Take care that your hearts be not charged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and the cares of this life."

In all this there is no authority for tithing, and the fathers of the Church were equally hostile to this species of extortion. The council of Antioch, in the fourth century, allowed the bishops to distribute the goods of the Church, but to have no part to themselves. "Have food and raiment, be therewith content," says the canon. It was only as real Christianity declined that tithing began. When the simple worship of Christ was corrupted by the adoption of Jewish and Pagan ceremonies; when the saints and martyrs were put in the room of the heathen deities; when the altars, the bishops, prebends, and other corruptions were introduced; then tithes commenced to support the innovations on the primitive faith.

It is impossible to ascertain exactly the period when tithes were first introduced into this country. During the first ages of the Church, its ministers were supported by charity, by oblations, and voluntary gifts. According to Blackstone, the first mention of tithes in any written English law is in a constitutional decree made in a synod held A.D. 786, wherein the payment of tithes is generally enjoined. But this was no law, merely a general recommendation, and did not, at first, bind the laity. They are next mentioned in the *Fœdus Edwardi et Guthurni*, or treaty agreed upon between king Guthrun, the Dane, and Alfred and his son Edward the elder, successive kings of England, about the year 900. Guthrun being a Pagan, it was thought necessary to provide for the subsistence of the Christian clergy under his dominion; accordingly, the payment of tithes was enjoined, and a penalty imposed for its non-observance: which law is countenanced by the laws of Athelstan, and this, according to the Commentator, is all that can be traced out with regard to their legal origin.* In fact, this inquiry, like all others into the early constitutional history of the country, is involved in darkness and contradiction. We are not even satisfactorily informed of the origin of the civil divisions of the kingdom into counties, hundreds, and parishes. These have been commonly ascribed to Alfred; but the researches of late writers have traced them to a period of much earlier date.

One thing, however, is certain as regards tithes, namely, that in England, in France, and, probably, in all Christian countries, they

* Commentaries, b. ii. ch. 3.

were divided into four portions: one for the bishop, one for the poor, one for the repair of the church, and one for the priest. A late writer* attempts to controvert the fourfold division of parochial tithes; but the fact rests upon such unquestionable authority that it may be deemed a truth placed beyond dispute. Without digressing into any learned research, it may be observed that the division of *quarta pars* is still retained in many parishes in Ireland; a point which appears to have been overlooked by the reviewer. In the Diocesan Returns to Parliament in 1820, the bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh and the bishop of Kildare remarked that in their dioceses is preserved the old episcopal establishment of the *quarta pars*; that is, a portion of the parochial tithes out of every parish is payable to the bishop.

The right of the poor to share in the tithe is established by the tenor of ancient statutes made to protect them from the consequences of the appropriation of parishes by spiritual corporations. After these appropriations had been effected, the religious houses were wont to depute one of their own body to perform divine service in those parishes of which the society had become possessed of the tithes. This officiating minister was in reality no more than the curate or vicar of the appropriators, receiving from them an arbitrary stipend. Under this system the poor suffered so much that the legislature was obliged to interpose, and, accordingly, the 15 Rich. II. c. 6 provides, that in all appropriations of churches the diocesan shall order a competent sum to be distributed among the poor parishioners annually; and that the vicar shall be sufficiently endowed. "It seems," says Blackstone, "the parishes were frequently sufferers, not only by the want of divine service, but also by withholding those *alms for which, among other purposes, the payment of tithes was originally imposed*; and, therefore, in this act, a pension is directed to be distributed among the poor parochians as well as a sufficient stipend to the vicar."†

One or two facts well attested are better than a hundred ingenious deductions and learned conjectures. What we have advanced not only establishes the original fourfold division of parochial tithes, but also the right of the poor to a portion of them. It also incidentally establishes another fact deserving attention, in showing the falsity of these representations made, from time to time, of the *charity and hospitality* of the abbeys and monasteries. By masses and obits and other sanctimonious pretexts, the monks possessed themselves of a large number of the benefices in the kingdom; instead of applying the revenues of these to the purposes of religion and charity, they perverted them to the enriching of their own fraternities, and a compulsory act of the legislature was necessary to compel them to restore to the poor a portion of their rights, and allow a decent maintenance to the parish priest. The little charity of the religious houses might be inferred from the general principles of human nature without the aid of facts. It is notorious they had become the abodes of luxury, indolence, and crime. Who

* Quarterly Review, No. 83. † Commentaries, b. i. chap. 11.

would expect, from societies so depraved, either charity or hospitality? The rich, the sensual and vicious, rarely sympathize with indigence. For their own ease, and, as a motive to indifference, they are mostly prompt to calumniate the poor with unjust suspicions, and represent a lively zeal in their welfare, either as undeserved or mistaken benevolence.

The practice of appropriating livings was first introduced by the Normans; and within three hundred years after, the monks had become the proprietors of one-third of all the benefices in the kingdom, and these for the most part the richest. At the dissolution of the religious houses by the 27 and 31 Hen. VIII. these benefices, by the common law, would have been disappropriated, had not a clause been inserted in these statutes to give them to the king in as ample a manner as the abbots, &c. had held the same at the time of their dissolution. Having thus become the proprietor of one-third of the benefices as well as all the plate, revenues, and wealth of the abbeys, the manner in which this monarch disposed of the wealth he had acquired accounts for the present state of ecclesiastical property. With a part of it he founded new bishoprics, colleges, and deaneries; large masses of it he gave to courtiers and noblemen; a portion he retained in his own hands, and the remainder applied to the maintenance of the reformed religion. Individuals, corporations, and colleges, who obtained grants from the Crown, obtained, also, all the rights annexed to them; and the present proprietors of the abbey-lands are proprietors of the tithes and benefices formerly attached to these lands. Hence it is so large a portion of the tithes are in the hands of laymen. It is calculated there are 3845 impropriations in England; that is, benefices in the hands of persons not engaged in the service of religion, but who receive the great tithes, leaving only the vicarial tithes or other minor endowments for the maintenance of the incumbent.

The effect on society of this new disposition of ecclesiastical property has been differently represented by writers. Discontent is inseparable from the reform of every established practice and institution. Those who profit by abuses and those who are benefited by their removal must view in different lights and hold forth different representations of measures by which they are so oppositely affected. With the dissatisfaction of the monastic orders, there can be no surprise; their condition was that of drones forced from the hives in which they had devoured in idleness the fruits of others' industry; but the dissatisfaction of other classes cannot be so readily explained. Mr. Hallam states that the summary abolition of the religious houses led to the great northern rebellion;* it is certain, from the popular ballads of the time, this important measure was a subject of regret to the lower orders; and old Harry Jenkins laments that those days were over in which he used to be invited to the Lord Abbot's chamber, to feast on "a quarter of a yard of roast beef and wassail in a black jack." Two reasons may be

* Constitutional History of England, vol. i. p. 77.

assigned for the existence of this feeling; either it may be ascribed to the cessation of the almsgiving and hospitality of the conventual bodies, or to the general ignorance of the people. The limited extent of the former has been already shown; if the populace could be conciliated by such miserable charity as we have adverted to, their fatuity may be likened to that of the multitude in more recent times, who are often blinded to their just claims by doles of soup or salt fish, or a bonus of 100 guineas out of an enormous civil list. The extreme ignorance of the people was, doubtless, the principal cause of their hostility to the reformation and disqualified them from duly estimating the advantages likely to ensue from so great a revolution. While the people continue unenlightened they must always be subject to their superiors, or those who possess influence enough to delude or direct them. The *Forty-Shilling* freeholders of Ireland were the alternate slaves of aristocratic landlords and fanatic priests, and in the votes they gave at the instigation of each, as well as in the tameness with which they submitted to be disfranchised, they have manifested a like rational view of their ultimate interests. The monks of the time of Henry VIII. were not less omnipotent over the multitude than the priests of Ireland, or those of Spain and Portugal; under the influence of the former the populace sung out whatever note they were directed; and, unquestionably, such views of the tendency of the reformation would be impressed upon them as best accorded with the interests of their spiritual guides.

To this cause we ascribe the popular feeling as regards the dissolution of monastic establishments. The same spirit opposed the opening of turnpike-roads, and the introduction of cow-pox and machinery. But it is extremely erroneous to maintain that the Reformation was not a great blessing to the country, and tended, most essentially, to better the condition of the working classes. Had popery (such popery we mean as existed at that day) continued the established religion, the present condition of the people would have been no better than that of the degraded rabble who have restored Don Miguel and Don Ferdinand, and whose miseries, in spite of the almsgiving and hospitality of convents, are sufficiently acute to prevent an increase in their numbers. From the general poverty of the Peninsula, and the state of its agriculture, commerce, and population, fettered and oppressed by aristocratic, ecclesiastic, and corporate immunities, we may form an idea of what England would have been without the Reformation. Knowledge was incompatible with the power of the monks, whose influence was founded on the general belief of miracles, the sanctity of relics, and other pious frauds, to which popular illumination would have been fatal. Without, therefore, the excitement produced by their dispersion, and the freedom of discussion with which it was accompanied, the people would have remained intellectually debased; their ignorance was necessary to the ascendancy of those in whose hands they were, and of course they would have been kept in that state, and withheld from the only means by which their condition in society could be ameliorated. If more substantial benefits have not resulted from the Reformation,

it may be easily traced to other causes. That great event certainly put the people in possession, by removing the mental incubus of a degrading superstition, of the most powerful instrument, by which this can be obtained.

It is to be regretted that, at the dissolution of the abbeys, the immense revenue at the disposal of the Crown was not appropriated in a manner more advantageous to the community. One of the great evils in our social economy is the unequal division of property—the vast masses in which it is accumulated by entails and rights of primogeniture in the hands of individuals. This evil was aggravated by transferring the endowments of the monks to the aristocracy, and thus was lost a favourable juncture, for obtaining better security for the liberties of the people, by a more equal partition of proprietary influence. Instead of wasting the spoils of the church on rapacious courtiers, it might have been appropriated, as in Scotland, to the establishment of a system of parochial education; or, it might have been applied to sustain the dignity of the Crown, or defray the charges of government without burthening the people, or to other undertakings of general and permanent interest. Of the magnitude of the opportunity thrown away, we may form some idea from the almost incredible wealth of the monastic institutions.

Of the annual value of 388 religious houses, we have no estimate; but, computing the value of these in the same proportion, as of the 653 of which we have the returns, the total revenue of the 1041 houses in England and Wales was £273,106. A prodigious sum in those days if we consider the relative value of money, and the smallness of the national income. But incredible as this revenue is, it was only the reserved rents of manors and demesnes, without including the tithes of appropriations, fines, heriots, renewals, deodands, &c. which would probably have amounted to twice as much. Upon good authority it is stated the clergy were proprietors of seven-tenths of the whole kingdom; and, out of the three remaining tenths, thus kindly left to king, lords, and commons, were the four numerous orders of mendicants to be maintained, against whom no gate could be shut, to whom no provision could be denied, and from whom no secret could be concealed.

Mr. Cobbett often amuses his readers by turning up his eyes, and uttering moon-struck exclamations, in contemplating the splendid cathedrals of Lincoln, Ely, Canterbury, and Winchester; it was not necessary, however, either the population, or general wealth of the community should be very great to enable the clergy to erect these magnificent, but comparatively useless, structures. Pious souls! they had possessed themselves of nearly the whole land and labour of the community, and would have grasped the remainder, had it not been for the interference of the legislature. Such have been the religious propensities of the English, at all times, that the fervour of their piety has oftener required checking than encouraging by their rulers. It was with this view the *Mortmain Act* was passed, in the reign of Henry VII. which, by prohibiting the bequest of property to the ecclesiastical bodies, prevented

the patrimony of almost every family in the kingdom from being engulfed by the cunning and insatiable monks. Had the vast amount of landed property acquired by spiritual corporations, previously to the passing of this statute, remained tied up in their hands, it must have formed an insuperable obstacle to the developement of the productive powers of the country, and under such a system, neither the riches nor numbers of the people could have greatly augmented.

The statements of church property before the Reformation would appear exaggerated had we not illustrative proof in the present state of Ireland and other countries. The mere remnant of the estates of the church, now held by the Irish Protestant Establishment, is calculated at two elevenths of the entire soil of the kingdom. In Tuscany, before the French Revolution had partially regenerated the dukedom, the priesthood was found, from inquiries instituted by the grand duke, to enjoy seventeen parts in twenty of the land. In Spain and Portugal, and in France, the monopoly of the church was nearly as great.

But we shall now leave the subject. We could not treat on the origin of church property in this country, without adverting to the changes effected by the Reformation. We shall next advert to the tenure on which the property of the church devolved, and continues to be holden by our Protestant Establishment.

It seems almost a work of supererogation to set about proving that the property of the established church is *public property*, the bare terms of the proposition apparently involving the demonstration. What can be understood by an established church, but a church endowed by the state, and, if so endowed, subordinate to the state, and for the benefit thereof? This principle has been recognized in every country in Europe. Wherever church property has been interfered with, (and we know none where it has not been interfered with,) it never appears to have been surmised that the state had not only the power but the right to give a new disposition to ecclesiastical endowments, either by appropriating them to the maintenance of a different religion, or to the necessities of the community. In England this power has been distinctly admitted, as appears from the measures adopted at the Reformation: at that period a commission was appointed to investigate the abuses of the church; a return was made of the value of all monasteries and religious houses, of parochial livings, episcopal and cathedral dignitaries, and every other species of ecclesiastical revenue, and the whole entered in a book, called *Liber Regalis*, or the King's Book. This important document has been recently reprinted by the Commissioners of Public Records; it is the only authentic survey of the revenues of the church; and the result was, as before described, an entire new disposition of ecclesiastical property. No claim appears to have been set up that the property was sacred, and in every succeeding period it has been treated in a similar manner. It has been always considered public property, and the government, for the time being, whether a monarchy under a Tudor, or a commonwealth under Cromwell, has always exercised the right of applying it to secular uses, or to the maintenance of

whatever form of faith might be in vogue, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Presbyterian.

Down to our own time the same principle has been constantly acted upon by parliament. In the numerous acts of parliament, at the close of the last reign, for regulating the sale and exchange of parsonage-houses and glebe-lands, of mortgages in cases of buildings and repairs, church property is invariably treated as public property, the *ownership* of which is vested in the State. Were it not so, the legislature could have no more right to interfere in the disposal of the property of the church than the property of other persons. It could have no right to pass the act for prohibiting the sale of spiritual preferment, by making it penal to present to any benefice for money, gift, or reward. It could have no right to pass the act, by which an incumbent is compelled to pay to his curate the whole, or a proportionate part of the income of his benefice. It could have no right to pass the Church-Building Acts, authorizing the division of parishes, glebes, and tithes; nor the various statutes for regulating the discipline of the clergy, by compelling them to reside on their benefices, or refrain from exercising any trade, or taking to farm more than eighty acres of land. It is never attempted by such legislative interference, to control the conduct and possessions of laymen. The possessor of an estate can sell it to another in his lifetime, or, after his death, bequeath it to posterity; but the clergy have no such power over their possessions. They have, at most, only a life-interest; and even of that they may be disinherited at the pleasure of their diocesan. The tenure of their property is similar to that by which Lord ABERDEEN holds the office of Secretary of State, or Mr. CROKER the Secretaryship of the Admiralty.

Mr. Campbell, Mr. Thackeray, and others, attempt to defend the claims of the clergy, upon the principle that they possess *corporate rights*, and hence contend that, though existing ecclesiastics might compromise their interests with the State, they could have no right to enter into any arrangement for the future, by which their successors might be deprived of the reversion of church-property. But for this analogy there appears no foundation. The church enjoys no prescriptive term of duration, but is always liable, at any time, to be re-modelled or dissolved by the legislature; and what more completely refutes its corporate pretensions, and establishes its entire dissimilarity to any civil institution of the kind, is its having no perpetual succession, either by descent or election, but is compelled, by the intervention of lay-patrons, to have its numbers kept up by the nominations of a third and alien party.

But though the Church cannot be likened to a corporation, there is a great resemblance between its rights and constitution, and those of our military establishment. Like the army, the clergy have their own laws, and may be tried by their own courts. A regular subordination exists from the lowest to the highest; from the curates, who are privates in the ecclesiastical corps, to the rectors and vicars, who are regimental officers; from thence to the bishops and archbishops, who are generals

and field-m Marshals: there are, also, district generals, inspectors, and quarter-masters-general under the names of archdeacons, deans, and prebendaries. The bishops have their regular staff of commissaries, chaplains, secretaries, and apothecaries. No clergyman can be absent without leave, and is liable to be broken or cashiered for neglect of duty. The king is the supreme head of the Church and the Army; he appoints to all the principal commissions, and in both a plurality of commissions may be holden. Supplies are voted by the parliament for both branches of service; either may be augmented or diminished, or entirely discontinued, as circumstances require. Lastly, the military have the same property in their muskets, barracks, and accoutrements, that the clergy have in their pulpits, tithes, and cathedrals; both may be transferred from the present possessors to others, or disposed of as old stores and establishments for the good of the State.

Such being the tenure of ecclesiastical immunities, it is mere sophistry to contend that the property of the church is as sacred as any other property. No analogy exists betwixt the rights of individuals, or even of corporations, and the rights of the church, and this view of the subject is confirmed by the history of the church itself, and the example of every European government. If the church ever had an indefeasible claim, it could only have appertained to the catholic church, to which the ecclesiastical revenues were originally granted. But whatever corporate or other rights the catholic church might claim, they were annihilated at the Reformation, and the legislators of that period plainly dealt with the possessions of the clergy, as neither perpetually attached to any particular class of persons, nor to any particular form of worship. They evidently treated church endowments as a sort of *wais* or *estray*; and, in assigning them pro tempore to the protestant establishment, they only assigned them on the terms of a tenancy-at-will, subject to such conditions of occupancy, ejection, forcible entry, &c. as the parliamentary landlords might think expedient from time to time to promulgate.

II.—PATRONAGE OF THE CHURCH.

If the possessions of the officiating clergy are not inviolate, the rights of patrons appear to have a still less substantial guarantee. In a recent parliamentary debate,* however, an eminent ecclesiastical judge, Dr. Lushington, maintained that, whatever opinion might be held on the general tenure of ecclesiastical property, there could be no doubt advowsons were strictly private property. As this is a point of great importance, it may be proper, before we give an exposition of the present state of church patronage, shortly to elucidate the nature and origin of patronal immunities. Our observations will, of course, apply solely to the rights of private individuals: of the tenure of the patronage vested in the king, the lord chancellor, the bishops, deans and

* House of Commons, April 27th, 1830.

chapters, there cannot be any difference of opinion; all these exercise their patronage *ex officio*, and unquestionably the same legislative power which has authority to regulate the functions of these offices, may make regulations as to the disposition of the ecclesiastical patronage appertaining to them.

A patron, as is well known, is one who has the right to present to ecclesiastical preferment. The exercise of this right is called a *presentation*, and the right itself an *advowson*. When the Christian religion was first established in England, the sovereign began to build cathedrals, and afterwards, in imitation of him, lords of manors founded churches on part of their demesnes, endowing them with glebe and tithes, reserving to themselves and heirs a right to present a fit person to the bishop as officiating clergyman. Hence most advowsons were formerly appendant to manors, and the patrons parochial barons: it was only by the corruption of later ages the lordship of the manor and the patronage of the church were dissevered, and any one, however mean and disreputable, might, by purchase, aspire to the dignity of patron.

Still such presentative right, however valuable it might be as a provision for relatives and friends, was deemed purely an *honorary* function, from the exercise of which no lucrative benefit ought to accrue to the possessor. For the better security of this principle, severe laws have been enacted to punish patrons who dispose of spiritual preferment from interested motives. If a patron present any person to a benefice for a corrupt consideration, by gift, promise, or reward, the presentation is void, and, for that turn, lapses to the Crown. If a person procure a presentation for money or profit, and is presented, he is disabled from holding the living. Even general bonds given to resign a benefice at the request of a patron, or in favour of some particular person, have been declared a violation of the statutes.* Such transactions have been termed *simony*, from their supposed relation to the offence of Simon Magus, who offered, with money, to buy the Holy Ghost. The design of the Legislature was to prevent the obtrusion of improper persons in the ministry, and guard against the patronage of the Church being perverted to objects of mere lucre in lieu of promoting religion and virtue. For the same salutary end, bishops may refuse to institute the presentee of a patron who is not sufficiently learned, or labours under moral or canonical disqualification.

In practice, however, all these precautions are nugatory, and the laws against simony are as easily evaded as those against usury or the sale of seats in the House of Commons. Preferment in the Church is as regular a subject of sale as commissions in the army; and a patron would as soon think of rewarding an individual for his learning and piety with the gift of a freehold estate as a church living. Hence, the door of the church is open to all, whether they have a *call* or not, provided they possess a *golden key*; and, in the Metropolis, offices are

* 31 Eliz. c. 6; 12 Ann, stat. 2, c. 12: also, the cases of Bishop of London v. Ffytche, and of Fletcher v. Lord Sondes.

openly kept in which spiritual preferment is sold as regularly as offices in the East Indies, medical practice, or any other *secular* pursuit. Not unfrequently, a *cure of souls* is brought under the hammer of an auctioneer, and a JEW, who maintains our Saviour was an impostor, may, if he please, purchase the right to select a proper person for the ministry of the Gospel. In short, church patronage is dealt with as a mere commodity; and the produce of tithe and glebes, instead of being employed as the reward of religious zeal and service, is bought, like a life annuity, as a provision and settlement for families.

These abuses must always continue while the law tolerates the sale of advowsons; it is in vain to prohibit the corrupt presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice, if a third person may purchase the right to present, and, under the semblance of a gift, convey the benefice to his employer. But such a perversion can in no way strengthen the claims of patrons, and entitle them to set up a mere incorporeal immunity as real property. The history of church patronage, as well as the enactments of the law, are repugnant to the idea of treating church patronage as houses and land. In cases of bankruptcy and insolvency, the assignees can neither sell nor present to a vacant ecclesiastical benefice; this is a *personal* function which cannot be delegated, but must be discharged by the insolvent himself. Were, therefore, the Church reformed to-morrow, and all its ministers placed on an uniform salary of £250 a-year, the patrons of livings could not claim a compensation for the loss of tithe and church estate. They never, either in law or in equity, had any property in the Church; their interests were purely *honorary*: and were the patronage of livings still continued to them under a reformed system, whatever interest they possessed would have been abundantly respected.

Having shortly exhibited the origin and tenure of patronial immunities, we shall next explain the present distribution of church patronage, and the mode and purposes for which it is usually employed.

The patronage of the Church is in the king, bishops, deans and chapters, universities, collegiate establishments, aristocracy, and gentry. The king's patronage is the bishoprics, all the deaneries in England, thirty prebends, twenty-three canonries, the mastership of the Temple, the wardenship of the collegiate church of Manchester, and 1048 livings. The lord chancellor presents to all the livings under the value of £20 in the king's book, which are about 780; he also presents to six prebendal stalls in Bristol cathedral, and to five in each of the cathedrals of Gloucester, Norwich, and Rochester; the ministers present to the remaining patronage of the crown. Upwards of 1600 pieces of church-preferment are in the gift of the bishops; more than 600 in the presentation of the two universities; 57 in the colleges of Eton and Winchester; about 1000 in the gift of cathedrals and collegiate establishments; and the remainder in the gift of the aristocracy and gentry.

The population-returns of 1821 make the number of parishes and parochial chapelries in England and Wales 10,674; which, divided

into rectories and vicarages, exhibits the following classification of parochial patronage:—

In the gift of	Rectories.	Vicarages.
The crown	558.....	490
The bishops.....	592.....	709
Deans and chapters.....	190.....	792
University of Oxford	202.....	112
University of Cambridge.....	152.....	131
Collegiate establishments.....	39.....	107
Private individuals	3,444.....	3,175

In addition, there are 649 chapels not parochial, making the total number of benefices in England and Wales, without allowing for the consolidation of the smaller parishes, 11,342.* To this number ought to be added upwards of 200 new churches and chapels recently erected under the authority of the Church-Building-Acts, and which must hereafter greatly augment the patronage and revenues of the established church. All these churches and chapels constitute, by the statutes, so many separate benefices, their ministers are incumbents, and bodies corporate, empowered to take endowments in land or tithes.

The benefices now in the gift of the Crown were reservations, when the manors to which they were appendant were granted away, or were acquired by lapse, or conferred on Henry VIII. and his successors, by act of parliament, at the dissolution of the monasteries to which they belonged. The livings belonging to the bishoprics, the deans and chapters, the universities, and colleges, were the gifts of their munificent founders. Those in the hands of private individuals have come into their possession along with their estates, or they have purchased or inherited the advowson dissevered from manorial rights.

Directly or indirectly the entire patronage of the church may be said to be vested in the Crown. No one is eligible to church-preferment, unless first ordained by the bishop; when eligible, no one can enjoy any benefice unless instituted by a bishop: the bishops, therefore, by ordination and institution, have a double power to exclude obnoxious persons: and the bishops themselves being appointed by the king, the latter has, virtually, the whole patronage of the church, having a veto on all ecclesiastical appointments by the aristocracy, the gentry, cathedrals, and other bodies in which church patronage is vested.

It is easy to conceive how much the power of the Crown is thereby augmented. The clergy, from superior education, from their wealth and sacred profession, possess greater influence than any other order of men, and all the influence they possess is as much subservient to government as the army or navy, or any other branch of public service. Upon every public occasion the consequence of this influence is apparent. There is no question, however unpopular, which may not obtain countenance by the support of the clergy: being everywhere, and having much to lose, and a great deal to expect, they are always active and zealous in devotion to the interests of those on whom their promotion

depends. Hence their anxiety to attract notice at county, corporate, and sessional meetings. Whenever a loyal address is to be obtained, a popular petition opposed, or hard measure carried against the poor, it is almost certain some reverend rector, very reverend dean, or venerable archdeacon, will make himself conspicuous.

It has been before remarked that church patronage is a regular article of sale. Besides being sold for money, spiritual preferment is devoted to political objects, and to the emolument of powerful families, chiefly the nobility. Few individuals attain high honour in the church, unless remarkable for their devotion to government; any show of liberality or independence is fatal to ecclesiastical ambition, as may be instanced in the history of a Watson, a Paley, or a Shipley. On the contrary, hostility to reform, subserviency to ministers, and alacrity in supporting them on all occasions, is sure to be rewarded. It would be curious to learn the claims to promotion of the individuals now filling the episcopal bench. Two of them are generally known as "*the Lady's Bishops*," from the nature of the court influence to which it is supposed they were indebted for their exalted stations. Marsh, one of the most orthodox, was a political pamphleteer, who wrote a book in favour of Pitt's war; after which he received a pension, then a bishopric. Blomfield owed his first preferment to a noble lord, whom he had pleased by his mode of rendering some Greek verses; his subsequent elevation is said to have been purchased by a compromise of principle on the catholic question: he is the most pragmatistical prelate on the bench, and, in the discharge of his episcopal functions, manifests much of that imperious and uncourteous demeanour, which not unusually accompanies the sudden attainment of great and undeserved authority. Dr. Monk is also an eminent haberdasher in "points and particles." He has been very recently raised to the *throne* of Gloucester, from the deanery of Peterborough and rectory of Fiskerton; and to which elevation it is not unlikely he paved the way by a fulsome dedication of his "*Life of Bentley*" to his friend and patron, Charles-James. The archbishop of Canterbury is, as far as we know, without any particular trait of distinction, either in his history or character. He was formerly dean of the Royal Chapel, and tutor to the prince of Orange; he seems a man of great singleness of mind; for, in one of his charges to the clergy, he deplores the absence of that "humble docility" and "prostration of the understanding" which formerly rendered the people such apt subjects, either of religious or political knavery. The bishop of Durham is of Dutch extraction, and some years since underwent a very severe prosecution for non-residence on a benefice in the City of which he was then incumbent. Majendie's father was a German, and filled a situation in the royal household, greatly to the satisfaction of George III. and queen Charlotte. Goodenough and Burgess are *proteges* of that pious and enlightened statesman, lord Sidmouth, who is now living in retirement on a pension of £3000 a year, granted for "high and efficient" services to church and state. Coplestone is the writer of a satirical squib, called "Hints to a Young Reviewer," directed against a well-known northern periodical. John Bird Sumner is considered a person

of some merit, and has written several articles in the *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*. Carey, too, who was sub-almoner to George III. is also an author and has published a sermon, preached on the occasion of the famous "Jubilee." Of the rest little is known; they have mostly been indebted for promotion to marriage, or to their connexions with the aristocracy, either by relationship, or from having filled the office of tutor, or secretary, in their families. In this roll of services, of accident of birth, of situation, and connexion, there is evidently no claim of public service or utility to entitle the bishops to their princely revenues and vast patronage.

One of the greatest abuses in the disposal of patronage is *monopoly*, in a few individuals, of influence and connexion, sharing among them the most valuable emoluments of the church. In all spiritual offices and dignities, there is great difference in value, and also in patronage; and the great object of ecclesiastical intrigue is, to secure not only the most valuable, but the greatest number of preferments. Hence arises the present disposition of church property. Scarcely any preferment is held *single*; the sees, dignities, rectories, and vicarages, being mostly held with other good things, and the most valuable monopolized by the relations and connexions of those who have the disposal of them; namely, the Crown, the Bishops, and Aristocracy. The bishops are frequently archdeacons and deans, rectors, vicars, and curates, besides holding professorships, clerkships, prebends, precentorships, and other offices in cathedrals. Their sons, sons-in-law, brothers, and nephews, are also pushed in to the most valuable preferments in the diocese. We shall give an instance of the manner of sharing the loaves and fishes of the church among particular families, from the example of SPARKE, the present bishop of Ely, who owed his promotion to the circumstance of having been tutor to the duke of Rutland. This man and his family are provided for as under:

The Bishop's See of Ely and dependencies, exclusive of patronage	£27,742	
The Bishop's eldest son, the Rev. John Henry Sparke, a prebend in the Cathedral of Ely	£400	
Examining Chaplain to the Bishop	100	
Registrar to the Diocese of Ely	300	
Lay Rector of Littlebury	303	
Chief Steward of Wisbeach, Burton, and other manors	200	
Rectory of Leverington, with the Chapelry of Parson Drove	500	
		1,803
The Bishop's son-in-law, the Rev. Edward Fardell, a prebendal stall in the Cathedral of Ely	400	
Rectory of Bexwell	300	
Feltwell, Rectory of St. Mary	400	
Ditto ditto of St. Nicholas	600	
Vicarage of Waterbeach	400	
		2,100
		£31,645

In the Ordination-Service a bishop is said to be intrusted with office for "the glory of God, and the edification of the Christian flock." He is particularly enjoined not to be "covetous," nor "greedy of filthy

lucre," and he promises to be "faithful in ordaining, sending, and laying hands on others." How far bishop Sparke has observed these matters, we shall not presume to say; it is obvious, however, that the faithful discharge of the duties of his office does not allow the "*sending*" of relations and connexions on the service of the church, unless duly and properly qualified. For any thing we know, his son and son-in-law may be amply qualified for these numerous endowments; indeed, they must be young men of extraordinary capabilities, to be able to discharge the duties of so many and important offices.

Bishop Sparke is not the only prelate who has shown some regard to the temporal welfare of his family. Other prelates seem to agree with lord Plunket and sir R. Inglis, in considering church property of the nature of private property, which cannot be better employed than in providing handsome marriage portions for their sons and daughters. Several prelates are of too recent elevation to have had time to send off numerous branches into the church; but an example or two from their immediate predecessors on the bench will illustrate the ordinary working of the system. The late archbishop SUTTON is an eminent instance of the perversion of ecclesiastical patronage. The Suttons remaining in the church are very numerous; among seven of them are shared sixteen rectories, vicarages, and chapelries, besides preachingships and dignities in cathedrals. Of the *eleven* daughters of the archbishop, several had the prudence to marry men in holy orders, who soon became amply endowed. Hugh Percy, son of the earl of Beverly, married one daughter; and, in the course of about as many years, was portioned off with eight different preferments, estimated to be worth £10,000 per annum; four of these preferments were given in one year, probably that of the nuptials, and intended as an *outfit*. This fortunate son-in-law is now bishop of Carlisle, to which see he was translated from Rochester. According to law he ought to have resigned all the preferments he held at the time of being promoted to a bishopric; but somehow he has contrived to retain the most valuable prebend of St. Paul's, worth £3000 per annum, and also the chancellorship of Sarum. Another daughter of the archbishop married the Rev. James Croft, who is archdeacon of Canterbury, prebendary of Canterbury, curate of Hythe, rector of Cliffe-at-Hone, and rector of Saltwood—all preferments in the gift of the archbishop.

Archbishop Sutton kept a favourable eye towards *collaterals* as well as those in a direct line. A sister married the Rev. Richard Lockwood, who was presented, in one year, with the three vicarages of Kessingland, Lowestoff, and Potter-Heigham: all these livings are valuable, and in the gift of the bishop of Norwich, and were presented by his grace when he held that see. The reverend pluralist still holds the three benefices, along with a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Peterborough. The archbishop left a son, or other near relative, chaplain to the House of Commons, and a nephew with several livings; but we cannot state particulars.

The late bishop of Winchester is another instance of a man who provided well for his family out of the revenues of the church. This pre-

late first held the see of Lincoln, and changed his name from Pretyman to Tomline, on acceding to a large estate bequeathed by a relation. He had been tutor to the "heaven-born Minister," to whom he was indebted for his earliest preferments. His children, it will be seen, from the subjoined enumeration, are not left destitute in the world.

G. T. PRETYMAN :

Chancellor and Canon Residentiary of Lincoln,
 Prebendary of Winchester,
 Rector of St. Giles, Chalfont,
 Rector of Wheathampstead,
 Rector of Harpenden.

RICHARD PRETYMAN :

Precentor and Canon Residentiary of Lincoln,
 Rector of Middleton-Stoney,
 Rector of Walgrave,
 Vicar of Hannington,
 Rector of Wroughton.

JOHN PRETYMAN :

Prebendary of Lincoln,
 Rector of Sherrington,
 Rector of Winwick.

The younger Pretymans had, also, some nice pickings out of the Mere and Spital charities, the wardenship of which the father got hold of by the exchange of a living in his gift; but as the subject has already been before the public, we refrain from dwelling upon it.

The Sumners, Blomfields, and Marshes are growing rather thick in the Red Book of the church, but, as before remarked, they have been too recently planted to have yet struck their roots wide and deep in the Lord's vineyard. The death of a bishop causes a movement in the church, like a change of ministers in the state. Expectations are excited, numerous removes follow, the adherents and connexions of the deceased are got out of the way as fast as possible, and all vacancies filled with the followers of the new diocesan. No regard is apparently paid to "the faithful ordaining, sending, or laying hands on others;" the great object is to secure the dignities, the fat living, the fine living, the noble living to the *next of kin*. The excessive greediness of filthy lucre has long been the reproach of the episcopal bench, and it is known that former diocesans of London, Durham, Winchester, and Canterbury, have died loaded with the spoils of the church. The wealth they amassed was due to the poor, to God, and the unfortunate of their own order. In the epistle which is read at their consecration, it is required of them that they should "be given to hospitality;" they, likewise, solemnly promise to assist the "indigent, and all strangers who are destitute of help." But who ever heard of a bishop being generous, of being given to hospitality, or assisting the unfortunate? who ever heard of them employing their immense revenues in any useful work; of their patronage of science, of literature, or the arts? Most of them have been only intent on amassing immense fortunes, and leaving behind

them their million or half million, like Jew-jobbers, loan-contractors, and commercial speculators. They live out of the world, consuming, in solitary indulgence, the spoil of the industrious, and without sympathy with the misfortunes and vicissitudes of life. They have no bowels even for the indigent of their own class: in the rich diocese of Durham it is known begging subscriptions are had every year for the poor clergy and their families; and measures introduced into Parliament for the general relief of the inferior clergy have usually failed from the opposition of the higher class of ecclesiastics.

In the disposal of *Parochial Patronage* there is the same abuse and monopoly as prevail in the higher departments of the church. The most valuable benefices, like the most valuable sees and dignities, fall into the hands of those whose chief claims are their families and connexions. By bringing forward the poor livings, it is usual to make out a favourable case for the parochial clergy; but from the small number of individuals among whom parochial preferments are shared, there are few except the curates entitled to much sympathy. We shall illustrate this point by laying before the reader a list of incumbents, selected almost at random, which will at once show the measureless rapacity that directs the disposal of church-preferment.

William Affleck, prebendary of York; rector of Silkston, with Bretton-Monk and Stainbury chapelries; rector of East Mediety; rector of West Mediety, Tresswell; perpetual curate of Thockerington; vicar of Westow.

Henry Anson, vicar of Buxton, with rectory of Oxnead and rectory of Skeyton; rector of Lyng with vicarage of Whitwell.

H. Bathurst, archdeacon of Norwich; rector of North Creake; rector of Oby with rectory of Ashby and rectory of Thurne.

J. W. Beadon, precentor and prebendary of Wells; precentor of Brecon; rector of Farley-Chamberl; rector of Christian-Mal.

J. T. Casberd, prebendary of Wells and Llandaff; also, one rectory, four vicarages, and two chapelries.

Charles W. Eyre, prebendary of York; rector of Carlton, in Lindrick; rector of Hooton-Roberts; vicar of Kilnwick-Percy; vicar of Pocklington with the chapelry of Yapham.

John Fisher, archdeacon of Berks; canon-residentiary of Sarum; also, two vicarages and three chapelries.

Dr. Forester, prebendary of Worcester; rector of Broseley; rector of Little Wenlock, with the chapelries of Barrow and Benthall; vicar of St. John's, Worcester.

Dr. Goddard, archdeacon and prebendary of Lincoln; chaplain to the king; vicar of Bexley; vicar of Louth; rector of St. James, Garlichythe, London.

Dr. Goodall, provost of Eton; canon of Windsor; vicar of Bromham; rector of Hitcham; rector of West Ilsley.

Dr. E. Goodenough, prebendary of Westminster; ditto of Carlisle; ditto of York; vicar of Wath, All Saints-on-Dearne, with the chapelries of Adwick and Brampton Bierlow.

W. Goodenough, archdeacon of Carlisle; rector of Mareham-le-Fen; rector of Great Salkeld.

Hon. T. de Grey, archdeacon of Surrey; prebendary of Winchester and chaplain to the King; rector of Calbourne; rector of Fawley with the chapelry of Exburg; rector of Merton.

Earl of Guildford, rector of New and Old Alresford, with chapelry of Medstead; rector and precentor of St. Mary, Southampton; master of St. Cross with St. Faith's.

- A. Hamilton*, archdeacon of Taunton; prebendary of Wells; chaplain to the King; rector of Loughton; rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, of St. Pancras, and of Allhallows, London.
- W. Hett*, prebendary and vicar-choral of Lincoln; vicar of Dunholme; rector of Enderby Navis; vicar of St. John's and rector of St. Paul's, Lincoln; minister of Greetwell and Nettleham chapelries; rector of Thorpe-on-the Hill.
- Hon. H. L. Hobart*, dean of Windsor and of Wolverhampton; rector of Haseley; vicar of Nocton; vicar of Wantage.
- Dr. Hodgson*, dean of Carlisle; vicar of Burgh-on-Sands; vicar of Hillingdon; rector of St. George's, Hanover-square.
- Hon. E. S. Keppel*, rector of Quiddeham, with rectory of Snetterton; vicar of St. Mary's and All Saints, Shottisham; rector of Tittleshall with rectories of Godwick and Wellingham.
- John Luxmore*, bishop of St. Asaph, with the rectory of Llandrillo; rector of Llangusteneau; ditto of Northop; ditto of Pennant.
- Dr. Madan*, prebendary and chancellor of Peterborough; chaplain to the King; rector of Ibstock, with chapelries of Dunnington and Hugglescote; rector of Thorpe Constantine.
- Herbert Marsh*, bishop of Peterborough; rector of Castor, with chapelries of Sutton, St. Michael, and Upton; rector of St. Clement and St. John, Terrington.
- Dr. Oldershaw*, archdeacon of Norfolk, with perpetual curacy of Coston; vicar of Ludham; vicar of Ranworth, with the vicarage of St. Margaret, Upton; rector of Redenhall with chapelry of Harlestone.
- Hon. G. Pellew*, dean of Norwich; prebendary of York; and rector of St. Dionis Backchurch, London.
- F. D. Perkins*, chaplain to the King; vicar of Foleshill; ditto of Hatherley-Down; ditto of Sow; ditto of Stoke; rector of Swayfield: ditto of Ham.
- Lord Wm. Somerset*, prebendary of Bristol; rector of Crickhowel; rector of Llangallock, with chapelries of Llanelly and Llangenneth.
- Lord John Thynne*, sub-dean and canon residentiary of Lincoln; rector of Kingston-Deverill; rector of Street, with chapelry of Walton.
- Wm. Trivett*, vicar of Arlington; ditto of Willingdon; ditto of Ashburnham, with rectory of Penshurst; rector of Bradwell.
- James Webber*, dean of Ripon and prebendary of Westminster; vicar of Kirkham; rector of St. Mary, Westminster.
- Fras. Wrangham*, archdeacon of York and prebendary of York and Chester; rector of Dodleston; vicar of Hunmanby, with chapelry of Fordon; vicar of Muston.

Abundant other examples of equal or greater enormity will be found in our List of Pluralists, in the Appendix. But nothing, in a small compass, attests more strikingly the abuses in patronage, and the scandalous manner in which offices are heaped on favoured individuals, than a comparison of the whole number of ecclesiastical preferments with the whole number of persons among whom they are divided. This is a test which may be applied with perfect accuracy. The only description of ecclesiastics whose number cannot be ascertained with precision are the curates and the inferior classes connected with cathedral and collegiate churches; the rest may be easily reckoned up from the *Clerical Guide*, which contains the names of all the episcopal, dignified, and beneficed clergy. From this work we find that the whole number of prelates, dignitaries, rectors, vicars, and perpetual curates, in England and Wales, is only 7694. Those who make the established clergy amount to 18,000 must needs include the parish-clerk, sexton, and grave-digger; but these functionaries of the church, not being in

holy orders, they certainly ought not to be included in the ecclesiastical corps, any more than the groom, valet, or other menials of clergymen. Neither ought to be included among the beneficed clergy their curates, who are merely the hired deputies of their principals, without institution or induction, and always subject to removal at the pleasure of the bishop or incumbent. Omitting these classes, we affirm that the whole number of endowed and beneficed clergy is, as we have stated, 7694, and by this diminutive number are the whole preferments of the church monopolized. These preferments are, as we collect from COVE and other sources, as under:—

Sees	26
Chancellorships	26
Deaneries of cathedral and collegiate churches ..	28
Archdeacons	61
Prebends and canonries	514
Minor canonries, priest-vicars, vicars-choral, and other dignities and offices, without including lay-offices in cathedrals	330
Rectories, vicarages, and chapelries	11,342
Total.....	<hr/> 12,327 <hr/>

Thus, there are 12,327 places of preferment divided among 7694 individuals, affording nearly two for each. This extraordinary monopoly of offices accounts for the vast number of pluralists. The whole number of incumbents in England and Wales is 7191; of this number, 2886 hold two or more rectories, vicarages, and chapelries. From data in the *Ecclesiastical Dictionary* we have drawn up the following classification of parochial patronage, exhibiting the number of individuals and the number of parochial preferments enjoyed by each.

PAROCHIAL PATRONAGE, showing the Number of Individuals, and the Number of Rectories, Vicarages, and Chapelries held by each.

Number of Individuals.	Livings held by each.	Total Number of Livings.
1	11	11
1	8	8
5	7	35
12	6	72
64	5	320
209	4	836
567	3	1701
2027	2	4054
4305	1	4305
<hr/> 7191 <hr/>		<hr/> 11,342 <hr/>

According to strict ecclesiastical discipline, no minister ought to hold more than *one* living; and, for the better care of the souls of parishioners, he ought to reside on his benefice. Laws have been made, and are still in force,* imposing forfeitures and penalties on clergymen who, having one living, accept another, or who absent themselves from their parishes. These laws, however, in practice, like the representation of the people in the lower house of parliament, are little more than the theory of church government. By dispensations and licenses, a man may hold as many livings as he can get, and he need not reside on any of them. Hence it is that considerably more than one-third of the whole number of incumbents are PLURALISTS. Many have five, four, and three livings. One man, and he is a BISHOP too, has no fewer than eleven parochial preferments. What an extraordinary divine he must be to be able to administer his various episcopal and parish duties! In the above classification is not included cathedral dignities, fellowships in the universities, chaplainships, professorships, masterships of grammar-schools, and other offices held by incumbents, and to which members of the Establishment are exclusively eligible. It merely shows the cutting-up of parochial benefices, and it is hardly necessary to add that those who are in possession of the most valuable and greatest number are connected by birth, marriage, politics, or in some other way, with those who have the disposal of them. Indeed, it is impossible to peruse the list of dignitaries and highly-beneficed clergy, without remarking that many of them are "honourable lumber," who have been turned over to spiritual pursuits from inability to succeed in the more arduous professions of the law, the army, or navy. In the church, as in the state, those only work for the public who have no other dependence, who are of plebeian extraction, and without support from family interest or aristocratic connexions.

III.—SINECURISM—NON-RESIDENCE—PLURALITIES—CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Sinecurism abounds more in our ecclesiastical than civil establishment. In the church almost every thing is done by deputy,—a consequence naturally resulting from her great wealth; for where large salaries are annexed great duties are seldom discharged. Those with large incomes have various reasons for not burthening themselves with official toil. First, they can afford to pay for a deputy; secondly, they can purchase or influence the connivance of others for neglect of their own duties; thirdly, they have the means for indulgence and recreation, which, consuming much time, leave little leisure for more serious avocations. Hence has arisen sinecurism in both Church and State; presenting the singular spectacle of one class receiving the pay, and another, born under less favourable auspices, doing the work for which the pay is received.

* Statutes 21 Henry VIII. c. 13, and 57 Geo. III. c. 99.

Among the different orders of our ecclesiastical polity, there are none, with the exception of the curates and a few beneficed clergy, who reside and do the duty of their parishes; the remainder being clerical sinecurists, filled with the Holy Ghost, to share in the loaves and fishes of the church. The bishops are most amply remunerated, and, as is usual in such cases, perform the least service. They employ archdeacons to visit for them; rural deans and others to preach for them; and a vicar-general to issue licenses, hold courts, and perform other drudgery: if otherwise engaged, they employ a brother bishop to ordain for them. They have their own chaplains, commissaries, and secretaries; in short, their work must be light, and chiefly consists in keeping an eye to the next translation, and the falling in of the fat livings. In the Ordination Service, however, they are enjoined strict and abstemious duties. It is there said a bishop must be "blameless," they are admonished "diligently to preach the word, and be conspicuous examples of various Christian virtues."

The duties of the Dignitaries cannot be very onerous. Mr. Gordon, in the debate on the Curates' Salary Bill, said he knew a clergyman who was dignitary in no fewer than six cathedrals. Were there any duties to perform, how could a man discharge the duties of so many different offices, in so many different places, perhaps at the distance of some hundred miles from each other? Archbishop Cranmer, in a letter to Cromwell, in the reign of Henry VIII., denounces the canons and prebendaries as a "superfluous condition."* He says, a prebendary is neither a "learner nor a teacher, but a good *viander*, who wastes his substance in superfluous *belly cheer*." If they were a "*superfluous condition*" under a Popish regime, they must be much more so under a Protestant establishment. The prebends, however, are very valuable, some of them worth £3000 a year, which will be a good reason with many for retaining them as a part of the venerable establishment. What further adds to their value is that, being benefices not having cure of souls, they may be held with other preferment without a dispensation for plurality.

The Parochial Clergy are, for the most part, a mass of sinecurists. In one respect Church of Englandism is an improvement on the original simplicity of the gospel, by rendering the discharge of its duties almost a mechanical operation. No long and expensive course of education is requisite to prepare her ministers: all her service is written; no extempore preaching or praying; it requires no mind, merely to be able to read is enough. To perform such a puerile and heartless ceremony, it is not surprising a majority of the clergy conceive it unnecessary to reside on their benefices. Of the violation of the law in this respect, of the penalties incurred by this violation, and of the Bill of Indemnity passed by our immaculate representatives to screen the delinquents, we shall relate an extraordinary example.

* Bentham's *Church of Englandism*, p. 250, where this curious epistle is inserted at length.

It is necessary to premise that, under the 43d Geo. III. c. 84, every spiritual person, possessed of any archdeaconry, deanery, or other dignity or benefice, is required to reside on his preferment; if he absent himself without license from the bishop, or some special cause of exemption, he is subject to penalties varying from one-third to three-fourths of the annual value of his dignity or benefice, recoverable by action of debt by *any person* suing for the same. This act was passed to amend a statute of Henry VIII. as regards the residence of the clergy; it has been subsequently modified by the 57th Geo. III. c. 99, and was introduced by Sir William Scott, (now Lord Stowell,) and solemnly enacted, in the year 1803, by king, lords, and commons. In the year 1811, Mr. Wright commenced nearly 200 different actions against the incumbents in the dioceses of London, Ely, and Norwich, to recover the penalties under the statute. This gentleman had been secretary to four right reverend bishops—the bishops of London, Norwich, Ely, and some other prelate—and, of course, had enjoyed the most ample opportunities for procuring correct information of the conduct of the clergy. These opportunities appear not to have been neglected. In a series of letters published in the Morning Chronicle, betwixt the 6th November, 1813, and the 11th of March, 1814, he favoured the public with many curious disclosures which had come to his knowledge during the discharge of his official duties.

In his letter of November 20th, he says that he has selected from well-authenticated documents 10,801 benefices, on which there are only 4,490 incumbents, even said to be resident, so that there are 6,311 confessedly non-resident incumbents; to supply whose places 1,523 resident curates are employed, which leaves 4,788, which are acknowledged to have neither a resident curate nor incumbent. The whole number of curates, whether resident or not, employed to supply the place of non-resident incumbents, is only 3,730, and only 1,793 of these are licensed; whereas, according to the canon and statute law, no person has a right to officiate until he is licensed. In one diocese, he says, one-third of the livings have had duty reduced from twice to once on a Sunday; and in another diocese, one-third of the parsonage-houses were returned in *bad repair*, as an excuse for the non-residence of our gentlemen pastors. Speaking of the *false pretences* made use of by the clergy, in order to avoid residing among their parishioners, and the scandalous lives they lead, he says,—

“ Now ill-health of the incumbent himself, or his wife, or daughter, is a common pretext, when no other *legal* cause can be found of avoiding residence. Of *twenty-two* licenses granted in one diocese for this reason, *three* only of the persons are in a state of health to warrant it, and the benefices from which they so absent themselves are very valuable. Whether the ministers whom I thus challenge as using false pretences deserve the imputation, will best appear by the mode of life they adopt. Some live in town during the winter; and although night air certainly cannot benefit a valetudinarian, they may be constantly seen at card-parties, routs, or the theatre. In summer, enjoying the amusements

of fashionable watering places ; whilst, too often, their curates, by the parsimonious stipend they afford them, are with a numerous family in a state of the greatest poverty. Others have beneficial schools in the neighbourhood of London. Others are continually to be met with near their residence in more pleasant parts of the country, enjoying the sports of the field, or vigorously endeavouring to detect some poor countryman who may have an unfortunate inclination to taste game ! Others may be seen most days driving their own carriage ! Some are in debt, and some are Curates near the Fens ! and all to observers seem *perfectly healthful* ; yet a certificate from a medical man is deposited with the bishop that they are not so ; probably it is six or eight years before when there might have existed a degree of temporary ill health, but after the cause ceases, the same plea is continued ; and a license once granted, is renewed as a matter of course.”—Lett. IV. January 6th, 1814.

Thus we see how these reverend gentlemen are employed ; not in administering spiritual instruction to the ignorant, comfort to the afflicted, or clothing to the naked. Oh ! no ; these are ignoble pursuits, the mere theory of the profession. They pretend sickness, in order to obtain a license for non-residence, that they may bawl at the card-table, frequent the playhouse, tally-ho, shoot, brandish the coachman’s whip, and bully at fashionable watering-places. Remember, these jovial spirits are all filled with the Holy Ghost,—empowered to forgive or not to forgive sins—have the cure of souls ; that their poor curates are starving on a wretched stipend, and that, in the maintenance of both, the industrious are deprived of the fruits of their labour, and the necessary comforts of their families wasted in the profligate and dissipated lives of their parochial ministers.

In Letter V. Jan. 18th, 1814, Mr. Wright gives the following statement, collected, he says, with infinite pains, of the state of ecclesiastical discipline in the small diocese of Ely, in 1813, compared with the year 1728 :—

In 1728.

On 140 livings, 70 Resident Incumbents.

Thirty-four who reside near and perform the duty.

Thirty-one curates who reside in the parish or near it.

The population was 56,944 souls. The duty was performed 261 times every Sunday.

And their income £12,719 per annum.

In 1813.

On the same 140 livings, 45 Resident Incumbents.

Seventeen who reside near and perform the duty.

Thirty-five curates, some of whom reside eight, ten, or twelve miles off.

The population is 82,176 souls. The service is performed about 185 times every Sunday.

And their income is now £61,474 per annum.

This is singular—duty neglected in proportion as it became more important and better paid. The population increased one-half, and the

number of times service is performed diminished one-third. The revenues increased almost fivefold, and the number of resident incumbents decreased one-third. What sincere and conscientious labourers in the vineyard of the Lord! How strikingly it confirms the observation that "Religion brought forth wealth and the daughter devoured the mother."

"The number of these (says Mr. Wright, Lett. II.) who have neglected their duty in contempt of the law, and in direct violation of solemn oath and bond, are far more than can be contemplated without a considerable degree of alarm."—One vicar obtained a license from a bishop for non-residence on one living, stating that he was going to reside near another in a different part of the kingdom. On inquiring for him at the place where he was supposed to reside, he was gone to a more *fashionable part of the country*. On another, to 'encourage him,' the great tithes were settled, worth near £1200: when he was instituted *he took AN OATH to reside*, which he afterwards neglected to observe. A rector, holding two valuable rectories worth £1200 per annum, to obtain which he gave bond to the archbishop that he would constantly reside on one, and keep a resident curate on the other, himself preaching on the benefice where he did not reside thirteen sermons every year: this worthy son of the church contrived to evade these conditions, and got a poor devil of a curate to do the work of both livings for £84 a year. Another rector, holding two livings, one worth £500, the other £400—he lived 200 miles off, and had neither resident nor licensed curate!

On the subject of *pluralities* and of non-residence together, the Secretary to four bishops says, "In one diocese there are about 216 clergymen, who each hold two livings; 40 who hold three each; 13 who hold four each; 1 who holds five; 1 who holds six, besides dignities and offices: and although many of these thus accounted *single* benefices are two, three, four, or five parishes *consolidated*, yet a great part of these pluralists do not reside on any of their preferments." In (Lett. VII.) he says, "I will prove that there are pluralists holding more than *seven benefices* and dignities."

It might be thought these statements of Mr. Wright were exaggerations or the result of personal pique, had they not been fully supported by the Diocesan Returns laid before the Privy Council, and ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. From these returns in the years 1809, 1810, 1811, and 1827, we shall insert an abstract, and then a few explanations: it will show at once the state of church discipline both at present and when the Secretary was arrested in his attempt to bring the delinquents to justice.

	CASES OF NON-RESIDENTS IN YEARS			
	1809.	1810.	1811.	1827.
1. Resident on other benefices	1240	1846	2059	2163
2. Absent without license or exemption	672	650	1033	405
3. Exemptions not notified	817	363	155	9
4. Infirmary of incumbent or family	465	389	396	395
5. Want or unfitness of parsonage-house	944	943	1068	1389
6. Incumbents residing in the neighbourhood, and doing duty	565	348	301	815
7. Unenumerated cases confirmed by the Archb. 8. Dilapidated churches	54	35	26	13
9. Sinécures	23	34	56	39
10. Livings held by Bishops	233	70	68	33
11. Recent institutions	26	35	21	10
12. Miscellaneous cases	—	54	33	71
	1271	38	51	41
Total open to connivance	6310	4903	5268	5383
Total of non-residents	7358	5840	6311	6120
Total of residents	3836	4421	4490	4413
Total of residents and non-residents together....	11,194	10,261	10,801	10,533

The first of these totals contains the twelve preceding classes, in each class of which there is room for connivance on the part of the bishops to whom the returns are made, and of falsehood and evasion on the part of the incumbents. The second total exhibits the whole number of non-residents; and the fourth, the total number of residents and non-residents together, in England and Wales. Hence it appears, that considerably more than one-half of the whole number of Incumbents do not reside on their benefices; receive large salaries for nothing; and the little duty that is performed, is performed by their curates.

As the Diocesan Returns for 1827* are the latest printed, it may be proper to exhibit more particularly, as follows, the state of church discipline in that year.

RESIDENTS :

Resident in the parsonage-house	3598	
Resident within two miles of the church or chapel, there being no parsonage-house	815	
Total residents	—	4413

NON-RESIDENTS :

Non-residents exempt	2619	
Non-residents licensed	2147	
Cases which could not be included among licenses or exemptions	1313	
Miscellaneous cases	41	
Total non-residents	—	6120

Total number of benefices returned	10583
--	-------

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 471, Sess. 1830.

Thus, only 3598 incumbents consider the parsonage-houses good enough to reside in; the rest are absentees. According to Mr. Wright, *want or unfitness of parsonage-house* is a common pretext for obtaining a license for non-residence: in one diocese, he says, one-third of the parsonage-houses were returned in bad repair. In 1827, this aversion of the clergy to their domicile appears to have augmented; in that year 1389, or more than one-eighth of the whole number of parsonage-houses in the kingdom were returned as not fit places for our aristocratic pastors to reside in; or, in other words, as an excuse for a license to desert their parishes, and roam about the country in quest of more lively amusements than churching, christening, and spiritually instructing their parishioners.

Among the clergymen *exempt from residence*, a large portion consists of those who reside on other benefices; that is, holding more livings than one, they cannot, of course, reside on both. The exemptions also include such privileged persons as chaplains to the nobility; preachers and officers in the royal chapels and inns of court; wardens, provosts, fellows, tutors, and ushers in the universities, colleges, and public schools; the principal and professors of the East-India college; and officers of cathedral and collegiate churches. The duties of many of these offices are such as ought to disqualify the possessors altogether from church preferment. For instance, what reason is there in masters of the Charter-house claiming exemptions; in other words, seeking to hold benefices and dignities in addition to their other offices and duties? Surely the management of a great public foundation, with upwards of 800 scholars, and incomes of near £1000 per annum, afford sufficient both employment and remuneration, without incurring the responsibility of a *cure of souls*. The same remark applies to the heads of colleges, and the masters and teachers of endowed charities. With so many friendless curates in the country, starving on miserable stipends, there is no need that any class of persons should be overburdened with duties, or corrupted by the aggregation of extravagant salaries.

Of the other cases of non-residence we shall offer only some brief remarks. The cases of those who plead *sickness and infirmity* have been sufficiently illustrated by an extract from Mr. Wright, page 30. *Sinecures* hardly need explaining; they are offices yielding masses of pay without any duty whatever. *Livings held by bishops* present a curious anomaly; the right reverend prelates commit the very offence of absenteeism, which it is their duty to prevent being committed by the subaltern clergy of their diocese. Lastly, among the *miscellaneous cases* are included those livings held in *sequestration*. In these instances, the incumbent being insolvent, possession, at the instance of some creditor, had been taken of the benefice, to raise money for the discharge of his debts. In 1811 the number of livings held by sequestration was seventy-eight; in 1827, forty-eight.

Such is a brief exposition of the state of church discipline, as exhibited by official documents, and the averments of Mr. Wright, when that gentleman commenced his actions against the clergy. We have

stated that the number of actions amounted to 200; and had Mr. Wright been suffered to recover, the penalties would have amounted to £80,000. To this sum he had an indisputable claim; a claim as sacred as any person can have to an estate devised by will, or on mortgage, or other legal security; his claim had been guaranteed to him by a solemn act of the legislature. Moreover, this gentleman had been basely treated by the right reverend bishops; and it was partly to indemnify himself for losses sustained in their service, that he endeavoured to recover the penalties to which the clergy had become liable by their connivance and neglect. In Letter I. he says, "At a committee of bishops, after a deliberation of nearly Two YEARS, it was decided that each bishop should give his secretary an annual sum of money. I have received it from *not one* of them, except my late lamented patron, the Bishop of London."—"Commiseration may have been given, (Letter VII.) but it was all I ever received from any one, and that would have been unnecessary, if the sums had been paid which were acknowledged to be my due."—"Two secretaries have, within the last ten years, fallen victims to depression of mind, arising from a want of sufficient income."

Most merciful bishops! most Christian bishops! What, not pay your poor secretaries their stipends! drive two of them to despair by your barbarous avarice! Surely you might have spared them the odd hundreds, out of your 10, 20, and 40,000 pounds per annum. But you are right reverend fathers, you can lisp about charity, turn up your eyes, talk about treasures in heaven, but your treasures are all in this world; there your hearts are fixed upon translations, pluralities, fat livings, and heavy fines on leases and renewals.

These, however, are private anecdotes betwixt Mr. Wright and his right reverend employers. Let us speak to the public part of the question. It is clear, from what has been said, that Mr. Wright was in possession of valuable information; he had resided in the Sanctum Sanctorum of the Temple, and was intimately acquainted with the secret management of the holy church. The clergy were terribly alarmed at his disclosures: they resorted to every artifice to avert the storm, and save their pockets: clubs were formed among the higher order of ecclesiastics: lies and calumnies of every shape and description were vomited forth to blacken the character of Mr. Wright; he was stigmatized as an "informer," who, availing himself of his official situation, was in part the cause of and then the betrayer of their guilt. In short, he became exposed to the whole storm of priestly cunning, malignity, and fury. But facts are stubborn things; and this gentleman had secured too firm a hold of his object to lose his grasp by the wiles and malice of the church. Their guilt was unquestionable; there was no chance of escape from the verdict of a jury; but that protection which it was in vain to expect from an English court of justice, they found in the great sanctuary of delinquency, an English House of Commons.

On the 17th November, 1813, BRAGGE BATHURST brought in a bill to stay all legal proceedings against the clergy on account of the

penalties they had incurred under the Clergy Residence Act. This bill shortly after passed into a law, almost without opposition. The whigs were silent. Mr. Whitbread and Mr. Brand indeed said something about the absurdity of enacting laws one day, and abrogating them the next; of the injustice of tempting people by rewards, and after they had earned them, interfering to prevent their being granted. But this was all. These gentlemen agreed it was necessary to protect the clergy; and, with the exception of the present Earl of Radnor, we do not find, in Hansard's History of the Debates, a single individual who raised his voice against the principle of this nefarious transaction. Mr. Wright, too, finding it vain to hope for justice from such a source, ceased his communications to the public relative to the clergy: the Parsons' Indemnity Bill passed into a law, and the church received a complete white-washing from the State for all its manifold sins and transgressions.

After the passing of the Bank Restriction Act, Gagging Bills, Sedition Meeting Bills, Press Restriction Bills, and of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Bills, it can hardly excite surprise that a bill passed to indemnify the clergy. In the latter case, however, there appears something more unprincipled and contemptible than in the former unconstitutional measures. The law imposing the penalties which Mr. Wright sought to recover had only been enacted in 1803: the professed object was to remedy the crying evil of non-residence; and to give greater encouragement to prosecutions, the act provided that the whole of the penalties should be given to the informer. Only eight years elapse, an informer comes forward, relying on the faith of parliament; prosecutions are commenced; when the legislature interferes—in utter contempt of justice and consistency—belying its former professions, violating its pledge, robbing an individual of his reward, and screens the delinquents which its own laws had made liable to punishment. It is impossible for the people to feel any thing but contempt for such a system of legislation. Laws, it is clear, are not made to principles, but to men, and are only terrible to the weak, not to the wicked.

Since the memorable actions of Mr. Wright nothing has intervened to improve the state of church discipline. An act of parliament,* passed some years after, was rather in favour of the clergy than otherwise, by abolishing the oaths formerly exacted of vicars to reside, by augmenting the monitory power of the bishops, and increasing the difficulties in the way of prosecution. Accordingly, the great abuses in ecclesiastical discipline remain unabated. Lord Mountcashell states that, since 1814, the number of incumbents has decreased to the amount of 2,500;† consequently, there has been a proportionate increase in pluralities. Of the number of resident and non-resident incumbents, the latest returns printed are for the year 1827;‡ in that

* 57 Geo. III. c. 99, the act which now regulates the residence of the clergy.

† House of Lords, May 4, 1830.

‡ Parliamentary Paper, No. 471, Sess. 1830. After what has been explained

year we have seen the returns were from 10,583 benefices in England and Wales, of which benefices 4,413 had resident, and 6,120 non-resident incumbents. Many incumbents who reside on their benefices do no duty; they are only attracted to their parishes by a fine cover for game, an excellent trout-stream, or, perhaps, they seek a quiet retreat, having worn out the better part of their existence in the dissipation of a town life.

Even those who reside and do duty, and are called the *working clergy*, perform a service requiring so little intellectual exertion, that it hardly merits the remuneration of a tide-waiter. They have scarcely ever occasion to compose and deliver an original sermon. The late Dr. Johnson, before he received his pension, was regularly employed in the manufacture of this description of commodity. The market is now overstocked; we seldom turn over a newspaper without meeting with advertisements for the sale of MS sermons, which, next to manufactures, seem the most abundant of all things. Sometimes parcels are advertised in *lithographic type*; this type being an imitation of writing, sermons composed in it pass with the congregation for original compositions, and the minister has the credit of propounding a good discourse, the result of the previous week's hard study and preparation. A lot of sermons of this description would be invaluable, and might be transmitted from father to son, like a freehold estate. If they became stale, they might be sold or exchanged with a neighbouring incumbent: this is a common practice with ministers who wish to indulge their parishioners with novelty; they exchange one old batch of sermons for another, from a different part of the country.

But enough of this. One is at a loss to imagine what the bishops have been doing while the church has been running to seed. These right reverend prelates are expressly appointed to watch over the morals and conduct of the inferior clergy; they are amply endowed and have numerous corps of officers to assist in the discharge of their episcopal functions. Yet they have been strangely remiss in attention to their subaltern brethren. Translations have tended greatly to produce this apathy; they divest the bishops of a permanent interest in their dioceses, and prevent them becoming intimately acquainted with the character and demeanour of incumbents. Until they attain the summit of prelatical ambition, they consider themselves only birds of passage; in their sees, what they chiefly take an interest in is, to fill up the vacant commissions, and then keep a steady eye on Durham or Winchester.

Under the primacy of the late Archbishop SUTTON energetic measures of reform were not likely to be countenanced; the career of this mild but rapacious prelate was not an inapt exemplar of the favourite

it is perhaps unnecessary to observe, that there are not actually so many individuals as the number of resident and non-resident incumbents in the Returns import. The apparent inconsistency results from *pluralities*. Every benefice with cure has an incumbent; but, as each incumbent often holds two or more benefices, it reduces the number of individuals to the amount we have stated, (page 27,) namely, 7191.

priestly motto on the Lambeth arms,—“ *Unite the meekness of a dove with the subtlety of a serpent.*” His grace and his grace’s family shared too largely in the advantages of the existing system to relish innovation. His lordship had profound views of the true policy of our spiritual establishment; was always for yielding a little to keep things quiet, rather than make a noise, knowing that the less was said about the church the more she would shine. Some of the primate’s successors, on the episcopal bench, appear hardly yet so rife in the mysteries of ecclesiastical dominion. A few years since, Marsh, of Peterborough, was tormenting his clergy with some unintelligible points of doctrine, and Bishop Blomfield lately astounded the inhabitants of London and Westminster with a “Letter on the Profanation of the Lord’s Day.” Had the strictures of this right reverend prelate been directed only against the baneful habit of drinking to excess, and other vices which disgrace the Sabbath, they might have passed without animadversion; but when he assails the Sunday press, and those innocent relaxations, conducive only to health and harmless enjoyment, he betrays a puritanism unsuited to the age. His lordship seems to opine a poor man is born only to work and pray, while a lord or a bishop may have his concerts, card-parties, and grand dinners every day, not even excepting the seventh. Such idle cant deceives no one; it only excites contempt or disgust. Men’s professions now pass unheeded; every thing is put into the scale and taken at its intrinsic worth. People quietly ask why should the clergy take ten millions annually out of the produce of land and industry? What services do they render society? Do they instruct the rising generation? No; they teach them little that is useful and a great deal positively injurious. Are they administrators of justice? No; God forbid they should. Are they profound statesmen? Do they often originate or encourage measures for the good of the country? No; they are most miserable politicians, and as to any project for bettering the condition of the great body of the people, they appear not to have a single idea. Well, but they are ministers of religion! Very few of them are so employed, and as to that the Dissenters are not less teachers of their flocks, and they receive no tithes, build their own chapels, and altogether do not cost one-tenth as much as the mere sinecure rectors of the Establishment.

IV.—REVENUES OF THE ESTABLISHED CLERGY.

It is impossible to produce a complete and accurate statement of the revenues of the clergy. The bulk of ecclesiastical revenue consists of tithe; but, besides tithe, an immense revenue is drawn from other sources. The clergy are almost in entire possession of the revenue of charitable foundations. They hold, exclusively, the professorships, fellowships, tutorships, and masterships of the universities and public schools. Immense landed property is attached to the sees, cathedrals, and collegiate churches. The clergy have, also, a very considerable income from glebe-lands, surplice-fees, preacherships in the royal

chapels, lectureships, town-assessments, Easter-offerings, rents of pews in the new churches, stipends of chapels of ease, chaplainships in the army and navy, chaplainships to embassies, corporate bodies, and commercial companies; besides which, they monopolize nearly all profitable offices in public institutions, as trustees, librarians, secretaries, &c.

The bishops, who hold the chief estates of the church, and to whom the parochial clergy, on obtaining licenses for curates and dispensation for plurality, are required by law to state the yearly value of their benefices, could furnish the most valuable information relative to the incomes of the clergy. But even this would be insufficient; nothing would throw complete light on the subject, but every member of the establishment, whether in lay or spiritual capacity, making a return of his income and emoluments. Before a long time has elapsed it is to be hoped Mr. Hume or Sir James Graham will adopt measures to supply this desideratum in public statistics; or, if general rumour on the immense revenues of the clergy be a *calumny*, the task might be advantageously undertaken by Sir R. Inglis or the Right Hon. Henry Goulburn. Till then we have a right to rely on collateral and inferential evidence. The endowments of the church are nearly as ancient as the first introduction of Christianity into Britain, and we know from the results of recent inquiries into the incomes of grammar-schools and other charitable foundations, which are nearly of cotemporary antiquity, that the increase in the value of ecclesiastical estates must be immense. The returns in *Liber Regis* are usually relied upon, in estimating the revenues of the church, and, perhaps, with other helps, it is the best authority to which we can resort. Of the vast increase in the value of land since the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* was obtained, the history of St. Paul's School affords a striking and appropriate exemplification. The estates of this foundation are situated in various parts of the kingdom; in A. D. 1524, they produced an income of £122 : 0 : 11; in the year 1820, the yearly income derived from the same estates was £5252 : 2 : 11½.* Here is an increase in value of nearly *fifty fold*, even under the wasteful and negligent management of a city corporation. The valuation of the rectory of Alresford in the King's Book is only £8 a year; the extent of the parish is 1400 acres, yet the *composition* for tithes paid by the parishioners amounts to £300 per annum; being an increase of more than *thirty-seven fold*. How great must be the incomes derived from such valuable rectories as those of Brentford, Houghton-le-Spring, Spofforth, and Stanhope—the richest in the kingdom,—which are rated respectively in the King's Book at £150, £124, £73 : 6 : 8, and £67 : 6 : 8 a-year.

The increase in population, by increasing the number of church-fees, has tended, as well as the increased value of land, to swell the revenues of the church, and no doubt many benefices are worth two hundred fold

* Third Report of the Charity Commissioners, p. 230.

what they were at the time of the Reformation. The vicarage of Hillingdon, held by the present rector of St. George's, Hanover-square, is an instance of the vicissitudes in clerical income. This, it appears, from the original record preserved in the archives of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, was a mere trifle, the great tithes of which, in the year 1281, were bestowed on the Bishop of Worcester towards defraying the expenses of his journeys to the metropolis, and for repair of the church, the small tithes being reserved for the maintenance of a vicar, to be appointed by the Bishop of London. That part of the contract relating to the expense of repairs has always been left to be performed by the parishioners, the Right Reverend Prelates of Worcester contenting themselves with receiving their share of the tithes, and reading a sermon to the inhabitants about once in a twelvemonth. These tithes have been of considerable value, and the management of them not a little extraordinary. The practice has been to let them to the *highest bidder*, by granting a lease of them for three lives, the purchaser paying down, in ready money, about £8000. Even on these terms it is said to have been a profitable bargain;* the last speculator in this spiritual traffic was the late Lord Boston, of whom the Bishop demanded the exorbitant sum of £8000, for the insertion of a new life, one of the former having dropt. His lordship neglecting to complete the agreement the lease was nominally made over to the bishop's daughter, who gave receipts in her own name for the amount of tithes collected.

Affairs continued in this state until the year 1812, when an act of parliament was obtained for enclosing and exonerating from tithes certain lands in the parish of Hillingdon; which was promptly acted upon, and a distribution of lands took place, by which 765 acres were set apart and appropriated in lieu of rectorial and vicarial tithes for ever. By this arrangement the bishop and vicar have obtained a fine estate in exchange for £16 a-year, the valuation of the living in the time of Henry VIII. All parties are more independent of each other—no contention about tithes nor compositions for tithes. The bishop repairs a chapel in lieu of the church; the vicar is an absentee, leaving a curate for the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants; and the only parties who have sustained any loss are the poor, in being deprived of the rights of common which their forefathers enjoyed.

Leaving these incidental illustrations of church property, let us endeavour to ascertain, upon some general principles, the amount of the revenues of the clergy. The estimates, by individuals, of ecclesiastical revenues are mostly limited to a valuation of tithe and the landed estates of the church. Of the unfairness of this mode of proceeding we shall hereafter speak; at present we shall submit to the reader two estimates of the revenues of the church, drawn up on very different principles, and by parties who entertain very different views of the state

* Coventry on the Revenues of the Church, p. 174.

of our ecclesiastical establishment. The first statement is from the third edition of a work, entitled “Remarks on the Consumption of Public Wealth by the Clergy.”

Estimate of the Revenues and Property of the Established Church in England and Wales.

Annual value of the gross produce of the land of England and Wales	£150,000,000
One-third of the land of England and Wales not subject to tithe for the clergy, being either tithe-free or lay-impropriations	50,000,000
Leaving the amount on which tithes for the clergy are levied	100,000,000
Supposing the clergy to levy one-sixteenth they get	6,250,000
Tithes	6,250,000
Estates of the bishops and ecclesiastical corporations	1,000,000
Assessments in towns, on houses, &c.	250,000
Chapels of ease stipends	100,000
Total.....	£7,600,000

From the Quarterly Review, No. 58.

Total number of acres in England and Wales	37,094,400
Deduct waste land, about one-seventh	5,299,200
Number of acres in tillage	31,795,200
Abbey-land, or land exempt by modus from tithe, one-tenth	3,179,520
Number of acres actually subject to tithe	28,615,680

This number, divided by 10,693, the number of parishes, gives 2,676 tithable acres to each parish.

In the Patronage of the Crown, the Bishops, Deans and Chapters, the Universities and Collegiate Establishments.

1733 Rectories, containing 4,637,508 acres, at 3s. 6d.	£ 811,563
2341 Vicarages, containing 6,264,516 acres, at 1s. 3d.	391,532
Annual value of Public Livings.....	1,203,095

In the Gift of private Patrons.

3444 Rectories, containing 9,216,144 acres, at 3s. 6d.	1,612,825
2175 Vicarages, containing 5,820,300 acres, at 1s. 3d.	363,768
1000 Perpetual curacies, averaging £75 each	75,000
649 Benefices, not parochial, averaging £50 each	32,450
Annual value of Private Benefices.....	2,084,043
8000 Glebes, at £20 each	160,000
Total income of parochial clergy	3,447,138
Income of bishoprics	150,000
Ditto of deans and chapters	275,000
Total revenues of the Established Clergy.....	£3,872,138

We shall first solicit attention to the estimate from the *Quarterly Review*, which is such an unfair and misleading representation of the revenues of the clergy that we ought almost to apologize to the reader for laying it before him. Arthur Young, who is no bad authority in these matters, says the revenue of the church was five millions in 1790, and how greatly it must since have augmented from the vast increase in population and produce. Notwithstanding the evasions and omissions under the Property-Tax, the returns for 1812* make the tithe of that year amount to £4,700,000, and, allowing for the increase in produce and fall in prices, it is not likely a less sum would be returned at present. During the war, the tithe was usually estimated at one-third of the rent; it is not much less now, but, suppose it only one-fourth, and the rental of England and Wales £31,795,200, or one pound for every acre in tillage; then the whole amount of tithe collected is £7,948,200; from which, if we deduct one-third for lay-tithes and land exempt from tithe, the church-tithes alone amount to £5,297,200.

Upon whatever principle we test the statement in the *Quarterly Review*, its erroneousness is apparent. The reviewer supposes the rectorial tithes to average only 3s. 6d. per acre, and the vicarial tithes only 1s. 3d. Both these sums are assuredly too low. The vicarage tithes, in consequence of the turnip-husbandry and other improvements in agriculture, are often more valuable than the parsonage. The returns to the circular inquiries by the Board of Agriculture make the tithe throughout the kingdom, in 1790, average, per acre, 4s. 0½d.; in 1803, 5s. 3½d.; in 1813, 7s. 9½d. Adopting the rate of tithe of 1803, and taking, with the reviewer, the land in tillage at 31,795,200 acres, the whole amount of tithes collected is £10,267,200; from which, if we deduct, as before, one-third for lay-tithes and tithe-free land, the amount of church-tithes is £6,844,800 per annum.

Again: the reviewer greatly misrepresents the proportion between rectories and vicarages. It is well known to every one the impropriate livings barely equal one-third of the whole number. Yet the reviewer makes the number of vicarages 4516; whereas, according to Archdeacon Plymley, there are only 3687 vicarages in England and Wales.† But it suited the sinister purpose of the writer to exaggerate the number of vicarages, in order to calculate the tithe of so many parishes at only 1s. 3d. per acre.

The estimate of the income of the Bishoprics at £150,000 is greatly below the truth. The revenues of the four sees of Winchester, Durham, Canterbury, and London alone exceed that sum. A vast deal of mystery is always maintained about the incomes of the bishops; but the public has incidentally been put in possession of some certain data on this point.

* Nos. 248 and 250, for 1814 and 1815.

† Charge to the Clergy of the County of Salop.

Last year the Archbishop of Canterbury applied for a private act of parliament to raise a loan of £37,000, to assist in altering and improving Lambeth-palace; when it came out that the revenue of the see of this poor member of the "college of fishermen" was ONLY £32,000 per annum. This is the representation of his own officer, Doctor Lushington. Mr. Baring stated that the revenue of the see of London would, by the falling in of leases, shortly amount to £100,000 a-year.* The Bishop of London, in reply to this, alleged that his income, allowing for casualties, did not amount to one-seventh of that sum. His lordship, of course, meant his *fixed* income, and did not include fines for the renewal of leases, nor the value of his parks, palace, and mansions. We can assure this right reverend prelate that the public never, in truth, thought his income, or that of his Grace of Canterbury, was so extravagantly high as on their own showing they appear to be. The see of Winchester is supposed to be worth £50,000 per annum. In one year the bishop of this diocese received upwards of £15,000 in fines for the renewal of leases.

But let us ascertain the total income of all the sees. In *Liber Regis*, the "King's Book," we have an authentic return of the value of the bishoprics in the reign of Henry VIII. As this return was to be the foundation of the future payment of first fruits and tenths, we may be sure it was not too much. However, in these returns, the See of Canterbury is valued at £2682:12:2 per annum; the See of London at £1000. This was at a time when a labourer's wages were only a penny a day. Now, it appears, from the admission of Doctor Lushington and the Bishop of London, that the present incomes of these sees are £32,000 and £14,444 a-year. So that one see has increased in value twelve and the other more than fourteenfold. The other bishoprics have, no doubt, increased in a similar proportion. Hence, as the incomes of the twenty-six sees in *Liber Regis* amount to £22,855 a-year, their present value cannot be less than thirteen times that sum, or £297,115, instead of £150,000, as stated in the *Quarterly Review*. This does not include the dignities and rectories annexed to the sees, or held in commendam, nor the parks and palaces, the mansions, villas, warrens, fines for renewals, heriots, and other manorial rights, enjoyed by the bishops, and which would make their incomes equal to, at least, *half-a-million* per annum.

The revenues of the Deans and Chapters may be approximated to on the same principle. Their incomes, like those of the bishops, arise principally from lands and manors, and certain payments in money. In the King's Book, the deans and chapters are valued at £38,000 a-year; consequently, they do not amount, at present, to less than £494,000 per annum, instead of £275,000. But the returns in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* are far from complete; several deaneries, pre-

* House of Commons, April 27, 1830.

bends, and other offices are omitted; it follows, our estimate is far below the annual worth of the ecclesiastical corporations.

The Reviewer considers each glebe to be worth only £20 a-year; but, when he is desirous of illustrating the penury of the church by comparing its endowments with those of the Church of Scotland, he values the glebes of the latter at £30 per annum. The writer omits to estimate the value of the parsonage-houses: they must be worth something, as they save rent to the incumbents or their curates.

But enough of the estimate in the *Quarterly Review*. The principles and purposes of this publication are so notorious that every one is on his guard against receiving, implicitly, any representations relative to the church from so suspicious a source. The first statement, from the "Remarks," &c. contains some inaccuracies and omissions which we shall endeavour to supply. Before, however, we submit a complete view of the revenue of the church, it will be proper shortly to advert to some items of ecclesiastical emolument usually omitted in inquiries of this nature.

Besides tithe and the landed estates of the church, there are, as before remarked, various other sources from which the clergy derive very considerable advantages. Of these, the first we shall notice are PUBLIC CHARITIES. The inquiries by the Royal Commissioners, so far as they have proceeded, tend to confirm the accuracy of Mr. Brougham's estimate of the revenues of charitable foundations at near TWO MILLIONS a-year. From the tenure of charitable endowments, the clergy have almost entire possession of this immense fund. In England and Wales, according to the returns under the Gilbert Act, there are 3898 *school* charities, of which the clergy enjoy the exclusive emolument; and, in the remaining charities, they largely participate as trustees, visitors, or other capacity. The pious credulity of our ancestors induced them to place implicit reliance on the clergy, little foreseeing how their confidence would be abused. Three-fourths of charitable property, at least, were thus placed at the mercy of ecclesiastics. It is certain that, in the inquiries recently instituted into charitable foundations, the worst abuses have been found under their management. The school of Pocklington, in Yorkshire, was a flagrant instance, in which a member of the established church was receiving a snug income of nine hundred pounds a-year for teaching ONE scholar. A right reverend prelate, who had been left IN TRUST, and his family, had appropriated the funds of the Mere and Spital charities. The grammar-schools in almost every town have become mere sinecures, seldom having more than two or three foundation-scholars; and the buildings piously intended for the gratuitous accommodation of *poor scholars*, have been perverted into boarding and pay schools for the emolument of their clerical masters. Bristol and Bath, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Ripon, and Preston are striking examples of this sort of abuse and perversion. In the principal foundations in the metropolis and neighbourhood, in the Charter-house, Christ's Hospital, the great

schools of Westminster, St. Paul's, Harrow, Rugby, and the Gresham Lectures, they derive great advantages as wardens, visitors, provosts, high masters, senior masters, ushers, lecturers, and assistants. Many of these offices are held by *pluralists*, who are, also, *dignitaries*, and yield salaries of £800 a-year, besides allowances for house-rent, vegetables, and linen, and large pensions of one thousand a-year, or so, on retirement. The present head master of the Charter-house, and the late and present head master of St. Paul's School, are examples of this sort of monopoly. In the colleges of Eton and Winchester, again, the established clergy have a nice patrimony. The government of these foundations is vested in a certain number of *reverend* fellows, and a provost, who is a *reverend* also. The value of a fellowship, including allowance for coals, candles, and gown, is about £1000 a-year; and a provostship, in good years, has netted £2500 per annum;* besides which, the fellows generally help themselves to a good fat living or two, which are in the gift of the colleges. Again, the established clergy have exclusive possession of the revenues of the Universities, to the exclusion of dissenters, and all persons of delicate consciences, who are scrupulous about taking oaths, and subscribing to modes of faith they neither believe nor understand. The value of a university fellowship is somewhat less than a fellowship at Eton or Winchester; but, then there are the professorships and tutorships, which, bringing the possessors in contact with the youth of the aristocracy and gentry, lead to livings and dignities. Numerous livings are also in the gift of the Universities, as well as the other charities we have mentioned, though we believe some of the offices in the Universities are incompatible with church-preferment; but then the livings are given to the *next of kin*, or otherwise negotiated, so that they are never lost to the family.

From these details we may conclude the established clergy share largely in the revenues of Public Charities; supposing the college and school charities average only £175 each, they will produce £682,150 a-year.

CHURCH or SURPLICE FEES, as they are commonly called, form another abundant source of revenue to the clergy. Originally, surplice-fees were paid only by the rich, and were intended for charity: what was formerly a voluntary gift has been converted into a demand, and, instead of the poor receiving these donations, they are pocketed by the clergy, and poor as well as rich are now compelled to pay fees on burials, marriages, churchings, and christenings. The total sums netted from this source we have no means of estimating correctly. In London, church-fees are supposed to be equal to one-third of the priest's salary. Beside the regular fee, it is usual, on the burial of opulent people, to get a compliment of a guinea or more for hat-band and gloves; at marriages, five guineas; at christenings, a guinea. In Ireland, the surplice-fees, aided by a few voluntary gifts, form the

* Evidence of Dr. Goodall, Third Report of Education-Committee.

only maintenance of the catholic priesthood ; and, in this country, the total revenue derived from fees and gratuities, is little short of one million a-year. The late Rev. Dr. COVE, whose estimate of church property is seldom more than one-half of its real amount, calculates the annual value of the glebe and surplice-fees of each parish, on an average, at £40 a-year, making, according to him, a tax upon the population of half-a-million per annum.

EASTER-OFFERINGS, OBLATIONS, &c. form a third source of ecclesiastical emolument. These Offerings, or *Dues*, as they are sometimes called, are certain customary payments at Easter and all church-festivals, to which every inhabitant-housekeeper is liable. Their amount varies in different parts of the country. In the North, they commonly pay sixpence in lieu of an offering-hen ; a shilling in lieu of an offering goose or turkey ; one penny, called smoke-penny ; one penny-halfpenny for every person or communicant above the age of sixteen, and so on. We have no means of judging the annual value of these good things. All that we can say is, that in some parts they are very pertinaciously levied, and considered by the established clergy as part of their "*ancient rights*." Probably, the value of Easter-offerings may be taken at £100,000 a-year.

The LECTURESHIPS, in towns and populous places, are another branch of clerical income. Where there is no endowment for a lectureship, the parishioners, if they desire a novelty of this sort, in addition to the ordinary routine of church-service, provide one at their own charge. The value of a lectureship, of course, varies with the number and liberality of the subscribers. No person can officiate as a lecturer unless approved by the incumbent and diocesan. Frequent squabbles arise from this cause ; the parishioners choosing a popular preacher, who, from scurvy jealousy, is not approved by the less-gifted incumbent. The lectureships are generally held with other preferments. Their total value may be stated at £60,000 per annum.

The next branch of revenue we shall notice are CHAPLAINSHIPS and those public offices which the Clergy may be said to hold *ex officio*, and to which they have always the preference. The value of chaplainships to the nobility, to ambassadors, public bodies, and commercial companies, must be considerable ; but of the value of these, and of the places held by the clergy in public institutions, it is hardly possible to estimate. Suppose £10,000 a-year.

Beside all these sources of ecclesiastical revenue, another and onerous burthen is imposed on the people by the NEW CHURCHES erected under the authority of the Commissioners appointed for that purpose. Upwards of £1,200,000 in Exchequer-bills has been already issued in aid of the voluntary contributions towards this undertaking.* The salaries of the secretary, surveyors, office-keepers, and other underlings of this commission cost the country more than £5,000 a year. One

* Annual Report on Church Building, Parl. Papers, vol. v. Sess. 1829.

hundred and nine churches and chapels have been completed, and one hundred and five more are in different stages of progress: what is the whole number intended to be erected, or the total expense nobody can tell, for the Commissioners have been recently *incorporated*, and in all probability their pious labours will be protracted for ages to come. Had the rich clergy contributed their just share to the First Fruits Fund there would have been no necessity for imposing this additional tax on the public. But the first out-lay is far from being the worst part of this extraordinary proceeding. All those new churches and chapels will have to be kept in repair by rates levied on the parishioners—dissenters as well as churchmen, and this, though many have opposed their erection as unnecessary. Then there is the stipends of ministers, clerks, beadles, pew-openers, and though last, not least, the guzzlings and feedings of sextons, churchwardens, and chapelwardens to be provided for; for though the patronage of the new churches is given to the patron or incumbent of the mother-church, yet the salaries of the minister and other officials, instead of being deducted from the income of the rector or vicar, are to be raised by a charge for the *rents of pews*. Only think of this holy device for raising funds! Notwithstanding the immense sums levied for the maintenance of the established religion, and though the frequenters of the new churches are actually compelled to pay tithes to the incumbents of their parishes, yet they are obliged to contribute an additional sum to enjoy the benefit of the national communion, and if they desire a *third* service on Sundays they must contribute additional for that too.* How much the revenues of the clergy will be ultimately augmented from this source, we have not the means of estimating. The incomes settled on some of the new ministers by the Commissioners are very considerable; that of the minister of St. Peter's, Pimlico, is £900 a year; and those of the rectors of the three new churches in the parish of St. Mary-le-bone are £350 per annum each. By an act of last Session that portion of the Crown-lands, called Sunk Island, in the Humber, was constituted into a parish and the minister perpetually endowed with the interest of £8,333 three per Cent. Consols. Suppose the annual charge of each new church £450 per annum, it will shortly add to the other permanent revenues of the church a yearly sum of £94,050.

We shall now collect the different items and exhibit a general statement of the revenue of the Established Clergy. The sum put down for tithe is church-tithe only, after deducting the tithe of lay-impropriations and allowing for abbey-land and land exempt by modus from tithe. The church-rates are a heavy burden on the people, but being levied at uncertain intervals, for the repair of churches and chapels, they do not form a part of the personal income of the clergy, and are omitted.

* Church-Building-Acts the 58 Geo. III. c. 45; 59 Geo. III. c. 134; 3 Geo. IV. c. 72; 5 Geo. IV. c. 103; 7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 72; 9 Geo. IV. c. 42.

Revenues of the Established Clergy of England and Wales.

Church-tithe	£6,884,800
Incomes of the bishoprics	297,115*
Estates of the deans and chapters	494,000
Glebes and parsonage-houses	250,000
Perpetual curacies £75 each	75,000
Benefices not parochial £250 each	32,450
Church-fees on burials, marriages, christenings, &c...	500,000
Oblations, offerings, and compositions for offerings at the four great festivals	80,000
College and school foundations	682,150
Lectureships in towns and populous places	60,000
Chaplainships and offices in public institutions	10,000
New churches and chapels	94,050

Total Revenues of the Established Clergy .. £9,459,565

We are confident several of these sources of emolument are rather under-rated. Perhaps it may be alleged that some items do not properly appertain to ecclesiastical income—that they are the rewards *pro opera et labore* extra-officially discharged by the Clergy. But what would be said if, in stating the emoluments of the Duke of Wellington or Sir George Murray, we limited ourselves to their military pay, without also including their civil appointments? The sums placed to the account of the clergy are received by them either as ministers of religion, or from holding situations to which they have been promoted in consequence of being members of the Established Church. There are several sums annually raised on the people which we have omitted, but which, in strictness, ought to be placed to the account of the Clergy. Large sums are constantly being voted by Parliament for building churches in Scotland, as well as in England; more than £21,000 has been granted for building churches and bishops' palaces in the West Indies; £1,600,000 has been granted for the aid of the *poor clergy*, as they are called, and who have been also favoured by their livings being exonerated from the land-tax; nearly a million has been granted for building houses and purchasing glebes for the clergy in Ireland; upwards of £16,000 a-year is voted to a society for propagating Church of Englandism in foreign parts;† and more than £9,000 is

* The see of Sodor and Man is not in charge in the King's Book, and is omitted in this estimate.

† The efforts to promote Church of Englandism by expensive establishments is attended with as little success in the Colonies as in the mother country. In Upper Canada, out of 235 clergymen, only 33 are clergymen of the Church of England. The Moravians are the sect whose mission is most successful in the West Indies. They mix familiarly with the Indians, instruct them in the arts of agriculture and building, and thus hold out to them advantages more readily comprehended than the mysteries of the Trinity, election, and the incarnation.

granted to some other Society for *Discountenancing Vice*,—a duty which one would think especially merged in the functions of our paid pastors. All these sums have been omitted; they certainly tend to augment the burthen imposed on the public by the Church: but as it is to be hoped they do not all form permanent branches of ecclesiastical charge, they are excluded from our estimate of church income.

The next consideration is the number of persons among whom the revenues of the Church are divided. It has been already shown that the number of prelates, dignitaries, and incumbents, is only 7,694, and by this diminutive phalanx is the entire revenue of £9,459,565 monopolized, affording an average income of £1,228 to each individual. Except the clergy, there is no class or order of men whose incomes average an amount like this. The average pay of officers in the army or navy will bear no comparison with that of the Clergy. Take the legal classes—the most gainful of all professions; add together the incomes of the lord-chancellor, the judges, the barristers, conveyancers, proctors, special-pleader, and every other grade of that multitudinous craft—the pettifogger of most limited practice included—and divide the total by the number of individuals, and it will yield no average income like that of dignitaries, rectors, and vicars. Still less will the fees and gains of the medical classes—the physician, surgeon, and apothecary—bear a comparison with the Church. The pensions, salaries, and perquisites of *employes* in the civil department of government are justly deemed extravagant; but compare the united incomes of these with ecclesiastics, from the first lord of the treasury to the humblest official in the Stamp Office, and the difference is enormous. The Church is a monstrous, overgrown CRÆSUS in the State, and the amount of its revenues incredible, unbearable, and out of proportion with every other service and class in society.

An average estimate of the income of the Clergy, however, affords no insight into the mode in which the enormous revenues of the church are squandered among its members. Next to pluralities, the greatest abuse in the establishment results from the unequal amount of income possessed by individuals of the same rank in the ecclesiastical order, and the unequal burthen of duties imposed upon them. The incomes of some bishops, as those of Llandaff, St. Asaph, and Bangor, barely equal that of a clerk of the Treasury, or of rectors and vicars whose conduct they are appointed to superintend; while the incomes of others exceed those of the highest functionaries in the land. Yet we are told, by Mr. Burke, that the revenues of the higher order of ecclesiastics are to enable them to rear their “mitred fronts in courts and palaces to reprove presumptuous vice.” But if one bishop requires a large revenue to support his dignity in high places, so does another. Among the archdeacons is like inequality, their incomes varying from £200 to £2000 a-year. And among the dignitaries and members of cathedral and collegiate establishments is similar disproportion. Many of the deaneries, as those of Westminster, Windsor, St. Paul’s, Salisbury, Lincoln, Exeter, and Wells, are very valuable, yielding, probably, to

their possessors incomes of £12,000, £10,000, £7,000, £2,000, £1,900, and £1,500 respectively. The prebendaries and canonries vary in amount from £250 to £2,000 a-year. Some of the precentorships are worth not less than £900 a-year; and many of the chancellorships, treasurerships, succentorships, and we know not how many other official ships, afford snug incomes of £400, £500, and £800 per annum. The minor canons some of them have £250; the vicars-choral £350; the priest-vicars, the chanters, and sub-chanters, and a hundred more popish names and offices, are all amply, though unequally, remunerated for their services.

In the incomes of the parochial clergy there is similar diversity and injustice. Many rectories, as before observed, are more valuable than bishoprics, having incomes from £8,000 to £10,000 a-year. The same may be said of the vicarages, being possessed of large glebes or large endowments, and sometimes both. While, again, it cannot be denied that there are some rectories, and in particular vicarages, whose tithes are in the hands of laymen, and without even a parsonage-house. In some instances, the deficiency of income has been so great, that it has been found necessary to unite the incomes of two or three parishes to produce an adequate maintenance to the officiating minister, who, in the care of so many churches, cannot have time to officiate at any of them properly; and thus, no doubt, are many souls lost which might be saved; some, straying into the fold of sectarianism, become jacobins and dissenters, to the great injury of the mother church, and the eternal reproach of the right reverend bishops, the very reverend deans, the venerable archdeacons, and other reverend dignitaries, who waste, in the pomp, vanities, and luxuries of the world, the sums which ought to be appropriated to the augmentation of these poor livings.

The penury of one part of the church is not less objectionable than the bloated and sinecure opulence of another. At the establishment of Queen Anne's bounty, in the beginning of the last century, there were 5597 livings (above one-half of the whole number) whose incomes did not exceed £50 per annum. The Diocesan Returns in 1809 give the following classification of poor livings under £150 per annum:—

	£	Livings.
Not exceeding	10	12
_____	20	72
_____	30	191
_____	40	353
_____	50	433
_____	60	407
_____	70	376
_____	80	319
_____	90	309
_____	100	315
_____	110	283
_____	120	307
_____	130	246
_____	140	205
_____	150	170

Total..... 3998

It is by grouping these poor livings with the rich ones, and averaging the whole, that a plausible case is often attempted to be made out in favour of the clergy. One writer, for instance, whose statement has been often quoted, makes the average income of each living in England and Wales only £303 per annum.* The Rev. Dr. Cove, adopting different principles of calculation, makes the average income of the parochial clergy only £255 each.† Both these estimates, it is apparent from what has been advanced, are very wide of the truth. There are 11,342 benefices, and only 7,191 incumbents; and these incumbents engross the entire revenue of the parochial clergy arising from tithe and other sources. Turning to the statement at page 48, and deducting from the total revenues of the established clergy the incomes of the bishoprics and ecclesiastical corporations, it will be found that the parochial clergy alone have a total revenue of £8,668,450, which, divided by the number of benefices and the number of incumbents, gives £764 for the average value of each benefice, and £1,205 for the average income of each incumbent. From this enormous income, the paltry stipends of £20 or £40 a-year, paid by some of the beneficed clergy to their curates, are, of course, to be deducted.

The representation which the *Quarterly Review*, and other misleading publications, is desirous of impressing on the public is, that there are about 10 or 11,000 benefices, held by about as many individuals—rectors, vicars, and perpetual curates—whose average income is the very moderate sum of £255 or £303 each. Such a statement, if true, would render the amount of the revenues of the clergy, and the distribution of these revenues, very little objectionable indeed. But we will soon show this is all mystification and delusion.

The real situation of the Parochial Clergy is this: in England and Wales there are 5098 rectories, 3687 vicarages, and 2970 churches neither rectorial nor vicarial; in all, 11,755 churches.‡ These churches are contained in 10,674 parishes and parochial chapelries; and, probably, after a due allowance for the consolidation of some of the smaller parishes, form about as many parochial benefices. Now, the whole of these 10,674 benefices are in the hands of 7191 incumbents; there are 2886 individuals with 7037 livings; 567 with 1701 livings; 209 with 836 livings; 64 with 320 livings. Look again, at page 27, and the whole mystery of parochial monopoly is solved. Or let any one look into the *Ecclesiastical Directory*, and he will find nearly one-half the whole number of incumbents are pluralists. Some are rectors at one place, vicars at another, and curates at another; some hold three or four rectories, besides vicarages and chapelries; some hold two vicarages, a chapelry, and a rectory: in short, they are held in every possible combination. But what does the secretary to four bishops, Mr. Wright,

* *Quarterly Review*, vol. xxix. p. 554.

† *Essay on the Revenues of the Church*, p. 124.

‡ Archdeacon Plymley's Charge to the Clergy of the County of Salop.

the "*Informer*," as BRAGGE BATHURST termed him, say on this subject: in one diocese the majority of the clergy held three livings, some five, and some six, besides dignities, and "yet a great part of them did not reside upon any of their preferments."

This is exactly the way in which the property of the church is monopolized. Some persons imagine that there are as many rectors as rectories, vicars as vicarages, prebendaries as prebends, deans as deaneries, &c. No such thing: the 26 bishops, 700 dignitaries, and about 4000 non-resident incumbents, principally belonging to the Aristocracy, enjoy nearly the whole ecclesiastical revenues, amounting to more than NINE MILLIONS, and averaging upwards of £2000 a-year each.

And for what service? what duties do they perform? what benefit do the people derive from their labours? The bishops ordain the priests; sometimes visit their dioceses; sometimes preach; and this we believe is the extent of their performances, and which, in our opinion, amounts to very little. As to the venerable, very reverend, and worshipful dignitaries, they perform still less. Let any one visit the cathedral or collegiate churches; go into St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, or York Minster, for instance; and observe what is doing in these places. No service is performed which interests the public. Persons may be found admiring the stone and mortar; but the vicars-choral, the priest-vicars, the chanters, or sub-chanters, or fifth or sixth canons, are very little regarded: and as to the dignitaries themselves, why they are never to be seen; many of them probably reside some hundred miles off, in more pleasant parts of the country, enjoying the amusements of the chase, or whiling away their time at card-tables or watering-places. Then, as to the non-resident incumbents, it must be admitted they are sinecurists, whose duty is performed, and for which they receive the salary, by deputy. Thus, it appears, that these three classes, without performing any duties of importance, absorb almost the entire revenue of the church.

The labouring bees in the established church are the curates, who receive a very small share of its emoluments. In a parliamentary paper, ordered to be printed on the 28th of May, 1830, containing the diocesan returns relative to the numbers and stipends of curates in England and Wales, we find that, for the year 1827, out of 4254 individuals of that class, there were 1631 with salaries not exceeding £60, and only eighty-four out of the whole number with salaries exceeding £160. There were fifty-nine curates with incomes between £20 and £30, and six with incomes between £10 and £20. There were 1393 curates resident in the glebe houses, and 805 more resident in their parishes. So that, either for want of parsonage-houses, or other cause, a vast number of parishes had neither resident curate nor incumbent. Supposing the stipends of the curates average £75 a-year, which is higher than the bishops, under the 55 Geo. III. have in many cases authority to raise them, their share of the church-revenues amounts only to £319,050. Yet it is this useful and meritorious order which performs nearly the whole service of the national religion.

To the curates we may add the possessors of the *poor livings*, as a portion of the clergy who really discharge some duties for their emoluments. These livings may be considered the mere offal, or waste land of the church, on which those who have neither rotten boroughs nor family influence, are allowed to graze. Their incomes not being sufficient to allow for the maintenance of a curate, many of the incumbents reside on their benefices and perform the duties of their parishes. But even this class is not in the indigent state some persons are apt to imagine. The returns we have cited of the value of poor livings in 1809, were considered, at the time, a gross imposition on the public and parliament. In consequence, however, of these returns, true or false, the incomes of the poor clergy have subsequently been greatly augmented. Besides Queen Anne's bounty, £100,000 has been voted annually by parliament; the benefactions in money, by private individuals, amount to upwards of £300,000; other benefactions, in houses for the residence of ministers, in lands, tithes, and rent-charges, are very considerable: to which we may add the advantages small benefices have derived from being exonerated from the land tax, and, from the increase in population, and in the value of tithes from agricultural improvements.

Another point necessary to be borne in mind, in considering the situation of the poor clergy, as they are called, is, that they are, like the non-resident aristocratical incumbents, nearly all pluralists. Few, indeed, only hold one living; and, probably, the whole 3998 livings under £150, are held by 1500 or 2000 individuals. That this is the case, is evident, from the returns made to the Commissioners appointed to exonerate small benefices from the land-tax, and which are now lying before us. In these returns for 1820 we find 2137 livings, or other ecclesiastical benefices of less than £150 in clear yearly value, had been exonerated from the land-tax.* Of 419 benefices exonerated from the land-tax in 1814 there were only ninety-two with incomes of less than £100 each, held *without other preferment*.† Hence we conclude that the poor clergy, whose incomes Dr. Cove made about £80, have, from pluralities, consolidation, and the other advantages mentioned, incomes of at least £150 each, and that, with the exception of curates, there are few poor clergy in England.

We have now afforded the reader, without exaggeration or distortion of facts, a complete and intelligible view of the total amount and disposition of the immense revenues of the Established Clergy. The chief points to be borne in mind are the diminutive number of the clergy, their sinecurism, and relative efficiency in the discharge of religious duties, and the monstrous inequality in their incomes. These points will best appear from the succinct statement we subjoin.

* Parl. Papers, vol. xi. No. 303, Session 1820.

† Parl. Papers, vol. xii. No. 474, Session 1815.

Statement, showing the Mode in which the Revenues of the Church, amounting to £9,459,565, are divided among the different Orders of Clergy.

Class.		Average income of each individual.	Total incomes.
EPISCOPAL CLERGY,	2 Archbishops	£ 26,465	£ 52,930
	24 Bishops	10,174	244,185
	28 Deans	1580	44,250*
	61 Archdeacons	739	45,126
	26 Chancellors	494	12,844
DIGNITA- RIES, &c.	514 Prebendaries and Canons ..	545	280,130
	330 Precentors, Succentors, Vi- cars-General, Minor Ca- nons, Priest-Vicars, Vi- cars-Choral, & other Mem- bers of Cathedral and Col- legiate Churches	338	111,650
	2886 Aristocratic Pluralists, most- ly non-resident, and hold- ing two, three, four, or more livings, in all 7037 livings, averaging each, tithes, glebes, church-fees, &c. £764	1863	5,379,430
PAROCHIAL CLERGY,	4305 Incumbents, holding one living each, and about one- half resident on their be- nefices	764	3,289,020
	4254 Curates, licensed and unli- censed, whose average sti- pends of about £75 per annum, amounting to- gether to £319,050, are in- cluded in the incomes of the pluralists and other incumbents.		
Total			£ 9,459,565

* The value of the deaneries, prebends, and other dignities, are calculated from the returns in *Liber Regis*, allowance being made for the increase in the value of ecclesiastical property in the proportion of thirteen to one. The result is, we are aware, an average value greatly below the truth. Some single prebends, as the golden ones of St. Paul's, Winchester, Ely, Lincoln, and Durham, are worth from £2000 to £5000 a-year. But, in the absence of more authentic information, we have been reduced to the alternative of either proceeding on the general principle mentioned or of relying on private reports—and we preferred the former.

Observations.

The above statement affords room for important remarks, in order to distinguish the over from the under paid, and the useful and meritorious from the mere sinecurists, in our ecclesiastical polity.

Every thing in this country is framed upon an aristocratic scale. Because some noblemen have enormous incomes, *ergo* the bishops must have enormous incomes, to be fit and meet associates for them. Thus, one extravagance in society generates another to keep it in countenance; because we have a king, who costs a million a year, we must have lords with a quarter of a million, and bishops with fifty thousand a year; and as a consequence of all this, a labourer's wages cannot be more than 10d. a day—he must live on oatmeal and potatoes, and have the penny roll not bigger than his thumb. But why should the income of a bishopric so far exceed that of the highest offices in the civil department of government? Burke's argument is not consistent. A Secretary of State has to show his “front in courts and palaces,” as well as a bishop; he is in constant intercourse with dukes and princes, yet his salary does not exceed £6000 a year. The bishops have their private fortunes as well as others, and there is no just reason why their official incomes should be so disproportionate to that of a lord of the Treasury, or Chancellor of the Exchequer.

An *Archdeacon* is considered the deputy of the bishop, and assists in the discharge of the spiritual duties of his diocese. As such, we think the deputy ought to be paid out of the income of his principal, and the revenues of the archdeaconries, applied to a fund to be raised, in lieu of tithe. Many bishops are not overburthened with duty, and have little need of assistants. One bishop of the United Church, it is well known, spent all his time in Italy, where he dissipated the revenues of an immensely rich see. Some English bishops do not reside in their dioceses. We knew a bishop who resided, within the last eight years, not more than a mile from St. James's Palace; he lived till he sunk into a state of complete dotage and imbecility; he was in fact left to the care of a *wet-nurse*, who treated him just like an infant: we never heard the church sustained any injury from the suspended services of this right reverend prelate, and he, or some one for him, continued, till his death, to receive the revenues of his see.

The *Dean and Chapter*, consisting of canons and prebendaries, are considered the *council* of the bishop. This is about as much of a farce as O'CONNELL's great crucifix in Merrion-square, or the virtues of relics and holy water. It is notorious, the bishop and his chapter are oftener at open loggerheads, than sitting in harmonious conclave to devise measures for the good of Mother Church. The bishop of St. David's is his own dean, and so endeavours to avoid such unseemly dissensions by being part *council to himself*. One of the most important offices of the dean and chapter, is to *elect* the bishop; that is choose the appointee of the M. of C—, or some court favourite, and, in the exercise of which franchise, they discharge as virtual functions as

the electors of Cockermouth or Ripon, who adopt the nominees of Earl Lonsdale and Miss Lawrence. The deaneries, prebends, canonries, and other cathedral dignities, are in fact honorary offices of great value; they are endowed with vast estates, numerous manors, and other good things, and have valuable livings in their gift; all which advantages are so much public income idly squandered. We have before adverted to the sinecure nature of these appointments before the Reformation, and, as a further proof, that they are offices without duties, we may mention that nominations to them are sometimes suspended. In 1797, when the cathedral of Lichfield was about being repaired, an act of parliament was obtained to defray the expense, by sequestrating the revenues of two vacant prebends. If the duties of these two offices could be suspended for an indefinite time, they might for eternity, and the revenues of all similar situations appropriated to the establishment of a fund in lieu of tithes, for the maintenance of the Working Clergy.

Next in order come the *Aristocratic Pluralists*. These are so many clerical sinecurists who receive immense incomes, without rendering any service to the community. They are mere men of the world, whose element is the race-course, the ball-room, and billiard-table. They seldom see their parishes: their residence is in London, at Paris, Naples, or Florence. If they visit their benefices, it is not in the capacity of pastor, but of surveyor or tax-gatherer, who comes to spy out improvements, to watch the increase of stock and extension of tillage, and see how many hundreds more he can squeeze out of the fruits of the industry and capital of the impoverished farmer. The poor parishioner, who contributes his ill-spared tithe to the vicious indulgence of these spiritual locusts, is neither directed by their example, instructed by their precepts, nor benefitted by their expenditure.

From the preceding statement, it is evident that about 2152 incumbents,* and 4254 curates, discharge nearly the entire duties of the established religion; that their average income is £301, which is more than the average income of the Scotch clergy; more than the income of the dissenting clergy in England, and the catholic clergy in Ireland; that, therefore, £1,974,503, the total revenue of these classes, constitutes nearly the whole expenditure the national worship requires for its maintenance and the discharge of its spiritual functions.

It is further evident that the Bishops, Dignitaries, and Non-resident incumbents, amounting to 6,025 individuals, receive £7,485,062 per annum, or seven-ninths of the revenues of the church; that these classes hold either merely honorary appointments, discharge no duties, or are greatly overpaid; that, in consequence, by abolishing non-residence, stalls, and other sinecures, and by reducing the salaries of

* The Diocesan Returns, laid before the privy council, for 1827, state that, of the non-resident incumbents, 1590 *do duty*; but the amount of duty they discharge is not stated. Many incumbents who reside do no duty. Allowing for the non-residents who do duty, and the residents who do none, we believe the number of incumbents, who actually perform the duties of parishes, is not greater than we have mentioned.

the higher clergy to a level with those of appointments in the State, or to a level with those of the best paid clergy in Europe, several millions of public income might be saved, to be applied either to the establishment of a fund for the maintenance of the operative clergy, in lieu of tithe and other ecclesiastical imposts : or, it might be applied, as a great portion of it was originally intended, as a provision for the maintenance of the poor ; or, as a substitute for those public taxes whose pressure, according to Mr. Huskisson, on " the springs and sources of industry," tends to produce national poverty and embarrassment.

Further, it is clear, from an impartial inquiry into the origin and tenure of church property, that it has been always considered public property ; that it was dealt with as such in the reign of Henry VIII., and by parliament in the reigns of George III. and IV., and the same policy has been pursued towards ecclesiastical possessions in every European state : that, in consequence, the legislature, after making a provision for the life interests of the present possessors of the church revenues, as was done at the time of the Reformation,* is authorized by precedent and the example of other nations ; and may, without injustice or inhumanity, adopt such measures for introducing a new disposition of clerical endowments, as is most conducive to the general interests of the community.

Lastly, it appears, on the authority of the ablest writers on ecclesiastical polity, that a religious establishment of any kind is no part of Christianity—it is only the means of inculcating it ; that a church establishment is founded solely on its utility ;† that the public endowment of any church implies, it is intended to be subordinate and auxiliary to the public good ; that the endowments of the Church of England were not originally granted for the support of a particular sect of religionists, but the general support and diffusion of the Gospel: that, in consequence, our episcopalian establishment is not an essential part of religion, but a mean of social advantage, and its policy and duration ought to be determined solely by its bearing on the public interest ; and that, on any future interference with the revenues of the church, the two most important considerations are—*first*, that if appropriated to the maintenance of religion at all, they ought to be appropriated to the maintenance of the teachers of Christianity generally, without distinction of creed ; and, *secondly*, that the amount and proportion in which they are so appropriated, ought to be determined by one sole object—the only true end of religion, government, law, and every social institution—namely, the general prosperity and happiness of the People.

We cannot, perhaps, more appropriately conclude this section than by a comparative estimate of the cost of Church of Englandism and of

* Hallam's Constitutional History of England, p. 78.

† Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, book vi. chap. 10.

Christianity in other countries. England affords the only grand monument of ecclesiastical wealth remaining to shew the intellectual bondage of men in times of superstition, before the more general diffusion of knowledge and education. Except in this country, the people have every where cast off the prejudice impressed upon them during the dark ages, that it was necessary to yield up a large portion of their property and the fruits of their industry, to be consumed by a numerous body of idle and luxurious ecclesiastics. Abroad, those clergyman are only respected and supported who zealously labour in the ministry, and are the real spiritual pastors of the people. Formerly, clergymen were almost the only persons who knew how to *read and write*; they took an active part in the administration of the laws, and were in universal request as secretaries and clerks. This was some excuse for their number and endowments. But these days are past, and the subjoined comparison will show that the churches of the Roman Catholic faith present as singular a contrast with their ancient endowments as with the present enormity of Church of England opulence.

Comparative Expense of Church of Englandism and of Christianity in all other Countries of the World.

Name of the Nation.	Number of Hearers.	Expenditure on the Clergy, per Million of Hearers.	Total Amount of the Expenditure in each Nation.
France	30,000,000	£35,000	£1,050,000
United States	9,600,000	60,000	576,000
Spain	11,000,000	100,000	1,100,000
Portugal	3,000,000	100,000	300,000
Hungary, Catholics	4,000,000	80,000	320,000
Calvinists	1,050,000	60,000	63,000
Lutherans	650,000	40,000	26,000
Italy	19,391,000	40,000	776,000
Austria	18,918,000	50,000	950,000
Switzerland	1,720,000	50,000	87,000
Prussia	10,536,000	50,000	527,000
German Small States	12,763,000	60,000	765,000
Holland	2,000,000	80,000	160,000
Netherlands	6,000,000	42,000	252,000
Denmark	1,700,000	70,000	119,000
Sweden	3,400,000	70,000	238,000
Russia, Greek Church	34,000,000	15,000	510,000
Catholics and Lutherans	8,000,000	50,000	400,000
Christians in Turkey	6,000,000	30,000	180,000
South America	15,000,000	30,000	450,000
Christians dispersed elsewhere ..	3,000,000	50,000	150,000

The Clergy of 201,728,000 people receive 8,999,000
 England and Wales 6,500,000 1,455,316 9,459,565

Hence, it appears, the administration of Church of Englandism to

6,500,000 hearers costs more than the administration of all other forms of Christianity in all parts of the world to 201,728,000 hearers.

Of the different forms of Christianity the Romish is the most expensive. A Roman Catholic clergyman cannot go through the duties of his ministry well for more than 1000 persons. The masses, auricular confessions, attendance on the sick, and other observances, make his duties more laborious than those of a Protestant clergyman with double the number of hearers: add to which, the cost of wax lights, scenery, and other accompaniments peculiar to Catholic worship. Notwithstanding these extra outgoings, we find that the administration of the Episcopalian Reformed Religion in England to one million of hearers, costs the people fourteen times more than the administration of Popery to the same number of hearers in Spain or Portugal, and more than forty times the administration of Popery in France.

Dissenters, like churchmen, are compelled to contribute to the support of the ministers and churches of the established religion, besides having to maintain, by voluntary payments, their own pastor and places of worship. In France all religions are maintained by the state, without distinction; all persons have access to the universities and public schools: in England, only one religion is maintained by the state; and all dissenters from the national worship are excluded from the universities and colleges, and from the masterships of grammar-schools, and other public foundations, endowed by our common ancestors, for the general promotion of piety and learning.

Dr. PALEY, a writer of great eminence, and whose principal work has been adopted as a text-book at Oxford and Cambridge, has shown that it is the policy of every government who endows a particular form of religion to make choice of that religion which is followed and believed in by a majority of the people. This principle, however, is not acted upon in this country. Notwithstanding the immense endowments of the established clergy, their gradation of rank, and protection by the state, it seems that owing to laxity of discipline, want of zeal, defects in the Liturgy, or other causes, that the adherents of the privileged worship constitute a minority of the nation.*

* Dissenters are usually considered to form seven-twelfths of the population of England and Wales. In Ireland the dissenters form about thirteen-fourteenths of the population: but the state of spiritualities in the sister kingdom we reserve for a separate article. The only public document which throws light on the proportion between Separatists and Episcopalians, in England, is a parliamentary paper, ordered to be printed, May 29th, 1812, and reprinted by the Lords in 1818. This document comprises only the results of returns from parishes containing a population of 1000 persons and upwards. In 1881 parishes of this description, containing a population of 4,937,789, there were 2533 churches and chapels belonging to the established church; the number of persons they would contain 1,856,108: in the same number of parishes there were 3438 dissenting places of worship. From this it might be inferred the number of dissenters is greater than we have stated. No doubt many small places in the rural districts, not included in the return, would have a church without a meeting-house. On the other hand the manufacturing population

England and Ireland are the only countries in the world where a tenth of the produce is claimed by the clergy. In Popish Italy the ecclesiastical tithe is only a fortieth, and is taken in kind. A prosecution by a clergyman for tithe is nearly unknown; whereas, in the United Kingdom, tithe causes, often forming the most costly and intricate source of litigation, are of frequent occurrence. In France the expense of all religions, Protestant and Catholic, is defrayed out of the taxes, like other branches of the public service. In the United States of America all the different modes of worship are maintained by their respective followers.

The monstrous excess in the pay of the English clergy appears from comparing their average income, with the incomes of the clergy of equal rank in other countries. In France an archbishop has only £1041 a-year; a bishop £625; an archdeacon £166; a canon or prebend £100; a rector £48; a curate £31. In Rome the income of a cardinal, the next in dignity to the pope, is £400 to 500 a-year; of a rector of a parish £30; of a curate £17: compare these stipends with the enormous incomes of the English clergy; and, making allowance for difference of living in the respective countries, the disparity in ecclesiastical remuneration appears incredible.

V.—RAPACITY OF THE CLERGY EXEMPLIFIED.

Though the avocations of the clergy are professedly of a spiritual

consists almost entirely of dissenters or methodists. Three sects alone, the Independents, Methodists, and Baptists, have 6056 congregations; and it is to be remarked that dissenting chapels are generally more crowded and afford greater seat-room in the same space than the churches of the establishment. A dissenting minister cannot subsist without a large audience, but the income of a Church of England priest is secure, if he have no audience at all, nor even a church to preach in. The structure, too, of churches—the system of proprietary pews—generally empty and locked up to guard against intrusion—the vast space taken up by the mayor's pew, the churchwardens' pew, and other parish officials, leaves little accommodation for the poor, and they have no alternative but to be crammed up, often standing in aisles, or driven to what are called free-seats, where they can neither hear nor see, or resort to a meeting-house.

With the immense revenues of the established church it must be sickening and disgusting to her best friends, to think how her interests have been neglected by those who have been wallowing in her wealth. It is obligatory both on bishops and incumbents, that neither parsonage-houses nor churches should fall into decay; yet it is a fact that there are 3000 churches and chapels, to which neither house nor glebe is attached, and there are hundreds of parishes without a church, though the tithe in these parishes is collected with as much rigour as in the rest. In the fine county of Kent there are *thirteen parishes* which have *no churches at all*, and forty-four parishes, each having less than 100 inhabitants, none of whom hardly ever see the face of a parson, and yet who have tithes exacted from them to the last blade of grass. Can it be a subject of surprise that dissenters increase and multiply under such a system? As to their actual number it is to be hoped measures will be adopted in the census of the population, about to be taken, to decide the point, and let us know to a certainty, from the ascertained proportion between dissenters and hearers of the established worship, to whom, according to the reasoning of Archdeacon Paley, tithes and other national endowments belong.

nature, no class has manifested so greedy an appetite for temporal advantages and enjoyments. They have been, like the daughters of the horse-leech, their cry has constantly been *give! give!* A brief notice of the application of First Fruits and Tenths, and, subsequently, of parliamentary grants to the augmentation of ecclesiastical revenues, will show as much rapacity on the part of the clergy and as wasteful expenditure of public money on the church as was ever exhibited in the darkest ages of monkish superstition.

First Fruits, as is well known, are the first year's whole profit or value of any spiritual preferment. The *Tenths* are the tenth part of the annual value of each living. Both first-fruits and tenths were formerly paid to the pope. The first-fruits were paid to his holiness on promotion to any new benefice, and the tenths were an annual income-tax of ten per cent. out of the revenue of the clergy. As the clergy would, when it was contrary to law, persist in the payment of these foreign exactions, Henry VIII. determined, on the dissolution of the monasteries, to keep them to the yoke to which they had voluntarily subjected themselves, and annexed the revenue arising from first-fruits and tenths to the crown: excepting, however, from the payment of first-fruits, all vicarages under ten pounds and rectories under ten marks per annum.

According to the valuation in the King's Book, the first fruits and tenths were paid, as the 1st of Elizabeth has it, to "the great aid, relief, and supportation of the *inestimable* charges of the Crown:" and so continued till the 2d year of queen Anne, 1703, when an act passed giving to a corporation, which was to be erected for the augmentation of small livings, the whole of the first fruits and tenths. This is what is called QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY, and amounted to about £14,000 per annum: it has been subsequently increased by an annual grant of £100,000 from parliament and the benefactions of individuals. By another act of the queen, the bishops are required, by oaths of witnesses, to ascertain the clear improved yearly value of every benefice with incomes not exceeding £50 per annum, and certify the same to the exchequer, in order to be discharged from the payment of first fruits: and all above that value to contribute, by the payment of first fruits and tenths, to the augmentation of the former.

The object of the queen in establishing this fund was to relieve the *poor clergy*; the real and only effect has been to relieve the rich clergy from a charge to which by law they were liable. In the 26th Henry VIII. a provision was made for revising, from time to time, the valuations under which the first-fruits and tenths were paid. It is probable the clergy of 1703 were apprehensive, as the nation was then engaged in an expensive war, that such a revision might be made; and in persuading the pious queen to renounce a portion of the hereditary revenue for the sake of "her poor clergy," they artfully contrived to insert a clause (the last in the act) by which the payment of first-fruits and tenths were made *perpetual at the original rate* of valuation!

The cunning of the rich clergy in thus shifting from themselves the

burthen of contributing to the relief of their poorer brethren, is only to be matched in degree by the folly shown in the application of the diminished revenue which this trick of theirs still left for the improvement of small livings. At the time when the Bounty-Fund was established there were, according to the returns, 5597 livings in England and Wales with incomes not exceeding £50, and which the slow operation of the fund, aided by parliament, would not raise to £150 in two centuries. Under such circumstances any rational being would suppose the governors and the legislature, by whom the disposal of the fund was superintended, would have made some inquiry into the condition of these livings. Some of them were of very small extent and scarcely any population; and might, therefore, have been advantageously united with one another or with other parishes. In others, the number of hearers was very great, and the parishes so large, they might have been advantageously subdivided. No attention was paid to these different circumstances. The governors of the bounty proceeded bountifully: they distributed a part of their money, in sums of £200, on any poor living to which any private person would give an equal sum; the rest, and greater part, they distributed *by lot*, letting each poor living take an equal chance for a £200 prize, without any regard to persons or urgency of claim. After this the story of Bridoye deciding suits-at-law by dice, after making up a fair pile of papers on each side, appears no longer an extravaganza. Up to the year 1815 the governors had made in this way 7323 augmentations of £200; but with benefices, as with men, fortune is not proportioned to desert or necessity. Some of the least populous parishes had a wonderful run of luck. In the diocese of Chichester, for instance, the rectory of Hardham, which, in 1811, contained eighty-nine inhabitants, has received six augmentations by lot, or £1200. The vicarage of Loddington, with forty-eight people, has had six augmentations,—£1200. In the diocese of Salisbury, Bremilham drew a prize; it contained fourteen people. Pertwood drew another; it had but twelve people. Calstone had £1000, including a benefaction of £200; its population was nineteen. In the diocese of Winchester, St. Swithin's, with twenty-four people, has received £800; and £200 has been expended on Ewhurst, which has seven people, and the living returned worth £99. In the diocese of York, Butterwick, with sixty-two people, has had five prizes,—£1000; while Armley, with 2941 people, and Allendale, with 3884, have only gained one each. Even in cities where the scattered condition of the population could afford no pretext against the union of parishes, the same random plan of augmentations has been pursued. In Winchester separate augmentations have been given to seven parishes, the population of which, all united, would have amounted only to 2376, and would, consequently, have formed a very manageable and rather small town parish. In short, the whole of the returns* teem with instances of extravagance, and clearly demon-

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 115, Session 1815.

strate this clerical *little-go* has been managed for a very different purpose than relieving the penury of part of the establishment. Indeed it is supposed that the church looks upon the poverty of some of her members as sturdy beggars look upon their sores, considering them a valuable adjunct for exciting an ill-judged compassion for the whole body, and securing impunity in idleness and over-feeding.

Had it not been for the fraudulent substraction of the higher clergy from the burthen of contributing to the relief of their poor brethren, there would have been no need of resorting to eleemosynary aid from parliament. If the first-fruits and tenths had been paid, subsequently to the gift of Queen Anne, according to the rate which the law provided, that is according to the *real value of the benefices*, instead of a million and a half, at least thirty millions would have been received from those taxes;* a sum not only quite sufficient to have removed the poverty of all the poor livings in the kingdom but to have established schools in every parish, and left a surplus beside for building additional churches, or any other useful purpose.

The funds at present in the hands of the governors are very considerable; not long since these faithful trustees for the benefit of the *poor clergy* advanced a loan for the repair of the palace of the rich archdiocese of Canterbury; and it is said they have come to a resolution to discourage as much as possible the purchase of lands, and to make certain annual allowances to clergymen with small livings from the dividend of the stock. By this latter proceeding the heads of the church have themselves begun to pay the clergy out of the public funds; affording an example, from high authority, of the practicability of this mode of paying the clergy generally.

In the course of the augmentations no security has been taken against *non-residence* or *plurality*. The governors have gone on increasing the income of two small livings, in order to make each of them capable of supporting a resident clergyman, while, after as well as before the augmentation, one incumbent may hold them together—reside on neither—and allow only a small part of the accumulated income to a curate, who performs the duties of both.

Rapacity and finesse appear inseparable traits in the character of the clergy at all times; and the recent conduct of our spiritual guides in the metropolis is a worthy counterpart to that of the clergy in the time of Queen Anne. The situation of the clergy of the City of London is different from that of the clergy in other parts of the kingdom. In the reign of Henry VIII. continual altercations took place between the citizens and their pastors relative to tithes and ecclesiastical dues. To put an end to these unseemly disputes the 37th Henry VIII. established a commission, at the head of which was the archbishop, with full power to give to their decrees the force of law, if they were *enrolled in the Court of Chancery* before March, 1545. By a decree of this commission the tithe of houses and buildings is fixed at the rate of 2s. 9d.

* Edinburgh Review, No. 75.

for every 20s. yearly rent, and 2d. for each of the family for the four yearly offerings. Great disputes, however, have arisen between the inhabitants and tithe-holders respecting the validity of this decree; for it appears, on the authority of Tomline and Raithby, and of recent decisions,* that it never was enrolled agreeably to the obligation of the act; which, consequently, negatives the claim of the clergy to 2s. 9d. in the pound on the rental. Some parishes have obtained acts of parliament, setting the question at rest as regards themselves; but in the parish of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, and others, it still remains in fierce litigation.

The claim of the clergy to 2s. 9d. is what they modestly term their "*ancient rights*," and would, doubtless, yield a very handsome remuneration. An assessment of 1s. in the pound, as stated by the City tithe-committee, would, in the smallest and poorest parishes, yield an income of £500 a-year; and an assessment of 2s. 9d. would raise the lowest living to £1400 a-year. To this exorbitant pretension the clergy have long looked with extreme desire, beholding the increasing wealth and population of the City with feelings similar to those ascribed by Milton to Satan when contemplating, with malign eye, the happiness of our first parents in the garden of Eden.

Though the decree emanating from the 37th Henry VIII. had no validity, it has formed the principle on which the assessment has been raised for the maintenance of the city clergy. The clergy, indeed, do not generally exact the 2s. 9d. but content themselves with 2s. 1s. 9d. or 1s. or, in short, any thing they can obtain,—insisting, however, at the same time, on their extreme forbearance in thus generously foregoing their "*ancient rights*." Even the 37th Henry did not intend to vest in the clergy the 2s. 9d. for their exclusive maintenance, but also for relieving the poor and repairing the edifice of the church. This they have always kept out of sight; the parishioners apparently acquiesced in their pretended rights; and it was only owing to the ill-timed rapacity of the Fire-Act Clergy which led to the explosion of their unfounded claims. Of the proceedings of the Fire-Act Clergy it may be worth while to give some account.

After the 37th Henry VIII. the clergy in the city were maintained by a certain pound-rate levied on the rental of buildings in their respective parishes. This practice continued till the great fire laid the major part of the city in ashes, burning down or damaging eighty-five parish-churches. After this catastrophe, the legislature enacted that some of the parishes destroyed should be united; that only fifty-one churches should be rebuilt; and that the ministers of those churches should, in lieu of their former allowance, receive certain fixed sums, levied by an equal pound-rate on the houses. This was the 22d and 23d Charles II. termed the *Fire-Act*. The clergy subject to the provisions of this act were perfectly satisfied, till the effects of the fire began to disappear, the rents of the houses to rise, and the city to get rich again. Then

* *McDougall v. Young*, Common Pleas, May 13th, 1826.

it was our reverend gentlemen became discontented: they saw, with grudging eyes, the increasing wealth of the capital, of which their fixed stipends would not allow them to participate; they talked unceasingly of their former pound-rate, of their "*ancient rights*," and at length determined, in good earnest, to apply to parliament.

This was in 1804, and, in consequence, parliament made valuable additions to their salaries; the lowest incomes were raised to £200 a-year, and many of the larger parishes, nearly, if not quite, to £600 a-year, exclusive of surplice-fees and other valuable emoluments. Such augmentation, to all reasonable men, appeared quite sufficient: not so to the clergy. In 1817 they applied for a further augmentation. This application was refused. In 1818 they came forward a third time, with their famous petition of the 4th February, filled with grievous lamentations about the loss of their "*ancient rights*." The bubble now burst. Parliament, disgusted with the rapacity of these "*sturdy beggars*," determined to refer their petition to a committee. It was soon discovered their "*ancient rights*" had no foundation;* that they never were entitled to 2s. 9d. on the rental, or any part of it; that with the 37th Henry VIII. which they had foisted into their petition, they had nothing to do, except it were to exhibit the craving and rapacious spirit which actuated them.

Various other disclosures were made. Of the thirty-five poor clergymen who had signed the petition, none of them, on an average, was receiving less than £500 a-year. Twenty-five out of the number were pluralists, and not a few of them the fattest pluralists of the profession. Some of the incumbents received annually £1200, £1500, and even £2000, while they did not pay their curates more than £60, £70, or £80 a-year.† Instead of residing in the parsonage-house, among the

* Parliamentary Papers, vol. viii. Sess. 1819.

† The incumbents in London are usually careful to select curates whose abilities are not likely to eclipse their own. Some do not stop here, but actually make personal appearance an object of consideration, always taking care to choose a curate of a less imposing figure than themselves. Hence many parishes, in order to have a tolerable discourse once on Sunday, and a decent-looking man for a preacher, go to the expense of paying an evening lecturer of their own choice; but here again they are often foiled by the reverend rector, or reverend vicar, refusing to let him preach in his pulpit. A Reverend Mr. Gunn, a man well remembered by many in London, was once placed in this predicament: he mentioned the circumstance to the late Bishop of London; on which his Lordship replied, alluding to the rector in question, "Ah, Mr. Gunn, you can shoot too well for him." The lecturers are paid by voluntary subscription; the lecturer going round with his subscription-book among the butchers, bakers, and publicans, humbly requesting "Mr. Pumpkin or Mr. Samuel Blewett to put down his name for any trifle he pleases."

Much of the spiritual duty in the metropolis is performed by *job-parsons*. These are unfortunate men, who, being without powerful influence or connexion, are unprovided with a regular curacy or benefice; or, perhaps, some of them have been cast on the world from an unlucky adventure at college, an ungovernable propensity to strong cordials, or the untoward issue of a love-affair in their native parishes. Whatever is the cause, they are met with in great num-

parishioners, the parsonage-houses of many were let to the merchants and manufacturers for counting-houses and warehouses, for which they received exorbitant rents of £200 or £300 a-year. Some of them were archdeacons, royal chaplains, or honourable and very reverend deans; some canons at St. Paul's, some were precentors, prebendaries, and held other dignified situations in cathedral and collegiate churches. Had they not been the most unreasonable and rapacious men breathing, there is little doubt but they would have considered the emoluments arising from their numerous preferments sufficient. But the wealth of India would not satisfy the cravings of this profession. Some of them were mean enough to lay in wait for the members going to the House while their petition was pending, and beseech them to support their claims for an increase in their stipends. It reminds us of the monks of St. Swithin's. These gluttons had thirteen dishes a day. Hume relates that they threw themselves prostrate in the mire before Henry II. and, with doleful lamentations, complained that the Bishop of Winchester had cut off three dishes a day. "*How many has he left?*" said the King. "*Ten,*" replied the disconsolate monks. "*I myself,*" said Henry, "*have only three, and I enjoin the Bishop to reduce you to the same number.*"

The emoluments of the metropolitan clergy far exceed those of the country clergy. The practice of uniting parishes, which is allowed by 37th Henry VIII. c. 21, when churches are not more than one mile apart, and under the value of £6, has been carried to a great extent in London. The City alone reckons 108 parishes, which have been formed into no more than seventy-eight benefices, having alternate patrons. Some of these livings are very valuable. For instance, the rectory of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, held by the Hon. E. Grey, and in the alternate gift of the King and Bishop of London, is worth £4000 a-year. The rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn, held by the Rev. Mr. Beresford, and in the patronage of the Duke of Buccleugh, is probably worth £5000. In Westminster, the rectory of St. George's, Hanover-square, held by the Dean of Carlisle, and in the gift of the Bishop of London, is worth, at least, £4000 per annum. The living of St. Giles's, held

ber in different parts of the town, and may be generally known from their care-worn appearance, soiled linen, and threadbare clothes. Like coopers, carpenters, and other branches of operatives, they have their *houses of call*, where they inform themselves of the state of ecclesiastical employment and the current rate of remuneration. It is to these places the well-fed pastors of London resort when, from *indisposition*—that is the usual pretext—or some unforeseen emergency, they require a deputy, or assistant, to pass through the morning-service. In this resource they are never disappointed, for, unfortunately, the market is overstocked with labourers in the vineyard, and the unattached sons of the church may be always met with in readiness, like so many ticket-porters, for any half-crown or dollar engagement.

From these traits may be learned the manner in which the churches are served, and the degraded state of discipline in the metropolis, where the revenues are more than ten times sufficient, if properly distributed, to pay for the permanent services of men of first-rate talents, independence, and character.

by the Rev. J. E. Tyler, and in the gift of the Lord Chancellor, is another valuable rectory. We could enumerate others, but these must suffice.

In considering the incomes of the metropolitan clergy, it must be remembered that they have many other sources of emolument besides their benefices. St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster-Abbey have many valuable dignities, equal in value to good livings, and which are principally shared among the London ecclesiastics. Then there are the appointments in the royal chapels, public libraries and museums, and the salaries they receive as ushers, masters, &c. in the numerous and wealthy charitable foundations, and which altogether must make their incomes immense.

From this representation of the situation of the clergy of the metropolis it is clearly their wisest course to follow the policy of primate SUTTON, and keep quiet. They should constantly bear in mind the fable of the dog with a piece of flesh, and not endanger what they possess by grasping at too much. But, somehow, the clergy ordinarily evince so little general knowledge, and are so blindly intent on immediate gain, that they usually adopt the most contracted and mistaken views of their permanent interests. Their conduct in respect of compositions for tithes strikingly exemplifies these traits in the clerical character. In order to render this part of the subject intelligible, it will be necessary to premise a few explanations.

A real composition for tithes is when an agreement is made between the landlord and parson, with the consent of the ordinary and patron, that certain land shall be discharged from the payment of tithes, by reason of some land, or other recompense, given to the incumbent in lieu thereof. Such agreements were anciently very frequent, till, by the 13th Elizabeth, it was provided that no composition for tithes should be valid for a longer term than three lives, or twenty-one years. This tended greatly to restrain compositions, and they are now rarely heard of, unless by authority of parliament. To establish the validity of these agreements previously entered into, it is necessary to *produce the deed itself*, executed between the commencement of the reign of Richard the First and the restraining act of Elizabeth, or such evidence from whence, independent of mere usage, it may be inferred that the deed once existed. Now this is often impossible. Time, as Lord Ellenborough once said, is a greedy devourer of patents and parchments, as of other things, and, probably, in the lapse of 240 years, the deed has been lost or destroyed, or other circumstances utterly preclude the production of the necessary proof. Clergymen, however, have often been found greedy enough to avail themselves of this strange peculiarity in the law, and suddenly claim the tithes from land that had been exonerated for centuries, and for which there could be no doubt a composition had been once granted. This was done, not many years since, by some sinecure priests of the cathedral of Exeter. We well remember the case of Dr. Peplow Ward, the rector of Cottenham. This was a real

composition traced so far back as the middle of the sixteenth century;* the parson claimed his tithes, and kept the land too, given in lieu of them, because the unfortunate owner could not produce the deed of conveyance.

In like manner a *modus*, or accustomed rate of payment, for tithe, is never allowed to stand after the clergyman wishes to terminate it, unless it can be proved to have existed prior to A.D. 1189. Day after day rank moduses, as they are called, though they have continued from time out of mind, yet bear evidence of not having existed before the return of King Richard from the Holy Land, are set at naught. Why our legal sages should have adopted this antiquated era for the bounds of legal memory, and to which, for the validity of a custom or prescription, it is necessary to trace an uninterrupted observance, no one can divine, unless it arise from the obvious interest they have in involving every rule regarding the rights of persons and property in the greatest possible obscurity and contradiction. The parsons, however, avail themselves of this dictum, and set aside every customary payment for tithe they do not like, which cannot be proved to have continued, without interruption, from the twelfth century. Hence no *modus* for hops, turkeys, or other thing introduced into England since that period, is valid. The keenness with which, on various occasions, the clergy have litigated these points is astonishing; and their conduct, both as regards compositions, first fruits, and tithes in London, shows the inherent rapacity of the order, and that there is no stratagem to which they will not resort, in order to avoid payments to which they are justly liable, or to fasten on the public some of their own dormant pretensions. They cannot, therefore, expect any indulgence, nor complain if a similar measure of justice be dealt to them. One of the most equitable retaliations would certainly be to insist on the payment of first fruits and tenths, according to the present value of benefices, and that, for the sake of the Church itself, we shortly hope to see enforced.

VI.—LITURGY OF THE CHURCH.

Apart from temporalities there is little to give offence in the established worship. Man is said naturally to be prone to religion, and were he deprived of his present idols, it is not improbable he might create others with more onerous pretensions. Those, however, most attached to the national establishment, cannot deny there are defects in its ritual, which, if they could be quietly absconded, would be a great improvement. The church has partaken, in some degree, of the improvements of the age. It has been argued out of intolerance towards every Christian sect. Some doctrines still retained, as part of the Athanasian creed and Thirty-nine Articles, are viewed, we apprehend, in the

* Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, vol. xxxvii. p. 551.

same light as special pleading and other legal fictions, rather as curious relics of a past age than as dogmas of practical use and belief. In its rites and ceremonial, the services it exacts are of easy performance to every class. The enforcement of the sabbath is an unmixed good to the industrious orders, while the hebdomadal inculcation of a future state of reward and punishment supports with hope or restrains with fear those who cannot appreciate the claims of a more enlightened morality. Philosophers can hardly begrudge the devotion of one morning out of seven to a parish church; if their feelings are not interested in the iterations of the Liturgy, their souls may be soothed by music and psalmody, and thus be enabled to range, with less disturbance, through the regions of science.

Mere politicians, who usually look on the sanctions of religion as more useful than credible, are little under its influence. The Tories were formerly a godly race of men,—they had religion at the heart, but with the Whigs it never went beyond the lips. Speaking of these once notable factions, the late Mr. Fox observes, “While the Whigs considered all religion with a view to politics, the Tories, on the other hand, referred all politics to religion. Thus the former, in their hatred to Popery, did not so much regard the superstition or even idolatry of that unpopular sect, as its tendency to establish arbitrary power in the state; while the latter revered arbitrary monarchy as a divine institution, and cherished passive obedience and non-resistance as articles of religious faith.”* Except Lords Bexley and Mountcashel, and the member for Newark, whose examples are of no great authority, there are few Tories of the old school. Both parties are now pretty well agreed in treating religion as an engine or ally of the state,—a branch of the police, or civil power, very useful for repressing disorders, or assisting that famous taxing machine, a mock representation, in extracting money out of the pockets of the people.

The Church appears inclined to cultivate a spirit of indifference and quietism,—the most favourable course it could take for a lengthened duration. It prosecutes no doctrine, controls, with a gentle hand, the passions of the multitude, gives full scope to the pleasures of the great, and is always prompt to throw the weight of its influence into the scale of government. So far is well and judicious. But there are some parts of the ritual of the church so staringly preposterous and so inconsistent with genuine Protestantism, that we think, if they are not shortly got rid of, they must, ere long, attract a dangerous share of popular attention. Lord Chatham once said “we have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Armenian clergy.” The boasted reformation from the first needed reforming, and, after an elapse of more than two centuries, the task cannot surely be deemed premature. It is not our intention to enter deeply into the subject, but we shall advert to some parts of the *Book of Common Prayer*, that afford too much colour for the sententious anathema of the great statesman whose words we have quoted.

* History of James II.

The portion to which we shall first call attention is the *Church Catechism*. This includes the elements of Church of Englandism, and is of the utmost importance from being first impressed on the minds of the rising generation. To the bad grammar and logic of this manual we do not attach much importance, though, entering as it does into early instruction, it ought to be unobjectionable on these points. But what is more serious, is the impracticable, superfluous, and unintelligible matter it contains.

For example:—in the baptismal service, the godfathers and god-mother renounce, in the name and behoof of the child, “the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh;” and this engagement the child solemnly promises to fulfil. But the utter impossibility of performance reduces the whole to an unmeaning ceremony: sponsors offer up their pledges without consideration, and christenings next to marriages are scenes of the greatest levity and indecorum.

That part where the child engages to make “no graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth,” is superfluous, inapplicable, and liable to be misunderstood. Though the *golden calf* was never more worshipped than at present, it is the most remote possible from a religious worship. The injunction was delivered to the Jews when they were surrounded by nations of idolators; but the nearest idolatry is distant from England at least a thousand leagues, and children can find no type of it in this country, except in the productions of the artist, to which they may mistakenly think it applies.

In another place occurs the phrase “all the elect people of God,” which savours strongly of that Calvinism to which Lord Chatham alluded, and which we verily believe, next to the anarchical principles of the French revolutionists, is the most anti-social doctrine ever propagated. Unless religion aids the cause of virtue, it is, comparatively, valueless; but the doctrine of election divests the Christian faith of every moral obligation. Of what importance can an individual’s conduct be, if his salvation depends solely on the fiat of a foregone conclusion. In the words of JOHN WESLEY, who has stated the case with equal force and truth, the sum of all is this: “one in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected; nineteen in twenty are reprobated! The elect shall be saved, *do what they will*: the reprobate shall be damned, *do what they can*.”* Affirm till doomsday that there can be no election without faith, and no faith without works, this is the essence of Calvinism; for which, *diabolism* would be a better name; and in the worst and bloodiest idolatry that ever defiled the earth, there is nothing so horrid, so monstrous, so impious.

Transubstantiation, or the real presence, was the great test of popery at the time of the Reformation. If a man, like Mr. O’Connel, for example, were to affirm his belief, that the body and blood of Christ are

* Dr. Southey’s Life of Wesley, vol. i. p. 371.

actually taken and swallowed, at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, he was hurried off to the stake, without pity or remorse. Yet, for the life of us, we cannot attach any other than a real and corporeal interpretation to the following interrogatories in the *Catechism* :—

Question.—What is the inward part or thing signified ?

Answer.—The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily and indeed taken and received* by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

Question.—What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby ?

Answer.—The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.

If this is not transubstantiation we do not know how it can be otherwise expressed. But it may be urged, that our apprehensions are wholly groundless, and no harm is done : that the catechism is intended only for the instruction of children ; that it is mere words learnt by rote, like the Lord's Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, and the Ten Commandments, at an age when the understanding is so little unfolded that no ideas are attached to them. Granted : but if the formula is to be so depreciated, we think it had better be consigned to the exclusive use of the dame schools, and the public saved the expense of maintaining so many well-fed clergymen, chiefly employed in impressing and confirming it on the minds of our juvenile population.

Another *morceau* from the mass-book is retained in the *Visitation of the Sick* ; in which the Protestant priest actually grants absolution of sin with as much *sang froid* and authority as Leo X. The sick person is directed to make a confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled in any weighty matter ; the priest then tenders a *carte blanche* in manner and form following :—

“ Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences ; and by his authority, committed to me, *I absolve thee from all thy sins*, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—*Amen*.

In the *Morning Service* is a form of absolution ; but the terms in which it is given are less explicit ; and the priest only declares a remission of sins to those who truly repent. Considering the era when the Common Prayer was framed, it is not surprising it retains some remnants of the superstition out of which it was fabricated. For aught we know, the power of granting absolution may have scriptural authority ; at all events it must often prove salutary, affording consolation at a moment when human nature most needs support, and compensating for any fears and anxieties which may have been felt during past life, by the certain hope held out of future forgiveness and beatitude.

The mode of filling a Church of England priest with the Holy Ghost, and endowing him with the invaluable elixir to forgive sins, and keep out of hell, or let drop into it whom he pleases, is not less extraordinary than the gift itself. It must be premised that no person can be admitted to any benefice unless he has been first ordained a priest ; and

then, in the language of the law, he is termed a clerk in orders. The mode of such ordination is thus described in the Liturgy.

"The bishop, with the priest present, shall lay their hands severally upon every one that receiveth the order of priesthood; the receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees and the bishop saying,

"*Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.—Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.*"

Truly this is marvellous in our eyes! The bare idea of any one who can swallow three bottles of wine, and leap a five-barred gate, being filled with the Holy Ghost, makes the gorge rise. But then the necromancy of this wonderful infusion. The bishop, only imposing his right reverend hands, saying, "Receive the Holy Ghost," and instantly, with the suddenness of the electric fluid, the Holy Ghost passes from the fingers of the bishop into the inside of—perhaps, a Clogher, a Hay, a Blacow, or a Daniels.

Talk of miracles having ceased,—they are performing daily. Talk of popery, of indulgences, and absolutions. Talk of the poor, naked, godless, unenlightened Indian, who wanders on the banks of the Niger or the Orinoco. Talk of the Chinese, who cuts his deity with scissars, or moulds him in paste. Talk of the wretched Hindoo, who immolates his victim to Juggernaut; or of the wild Tartar, who worships the invisible Lama. Talk of all or any of these, or go to what age or country we may, for examples of supernatural pretension, can we find any to match this part of the rites of the Church of England?

We shall now leave to the Reader's further consideration the subject of the church ritual. It is only a work of men's hands, and cannot, of course, claim the same infallibility as the Holy Scriptures. An order in council is any time sufficient authority for introducing alterations in the Liturgy; and, even within our own time, it has been subjected both to curtailment and additions. George IV., it will long be remembered, ordered the name of Queen Caroline to be struck out, as a person unworthy of the prayers of the people. Lord Sidmouth, who now forms a fragment of the *dead weight*, during his secretaryship, directed four prayers to be interpolated, and they form a regular portion of the church service. In the few observations we have ventured to put forward, our purpose has been only to advert to such parts as seemed most startling to vulgar apprehension; and in doing this, we trust, nothing irreverent has escaped us, or in derogation of the general utility of the *Book of Common Prayer*. With all its imperfections we greatly prefer the established ceremonial to the random out-pourings of the conventicle; and think the measured solemnities deliberately framed for the various occasions of life, preferable to those wild exhortations which have no standard but the intellect of the preacher, his thirst of gain or popularity, or the passions and fatuity of his hearers.

VII.—WHO WOULD BE BENEFITED BY A REFORM OF THE CHURCH ?

A reform of the Church, like most other reforms, would permanently benefit the many and only temporarily injure the few. The lawn-sleeves, the shovel-hats, silk-aprons, and monopolizing incumbents would be the chief sufferers; while the condition of the most numerous and useful order of the clergy would be improved. Such odious abuses as non-residence and pluralities would be abolished, and the shameful injustice of one man doing the duty and another receiving the reward would be no longer tolerated. Every district, or parish, requiring the services of an officiating clergyman would be provided with one to whom the degrading epithet of "*poor curate*" or "*poor parson*" could never be justly applied. By mitigating the penury of the working clergy their respectability and influence would be augmented, and every neighbourhood would enjoy the advantages which are known to result from the permanent abode of at least one educated, intelligent, and exemplary individual.

The equalizing of the value of sees would remove the abuse of *translations*, and thereby effect a great improvement in the bench of bishops. It is only a few lucky individuals who obtain the rich prizes of Canterbury, Winchester, London, Ely, and Durham, that are benefited by the unequal revenues of the bishoprics. Many prelates have barely income enough to support the dignity of their stations; yet they share, in common with the rest, the public odium attached to their class from the inordinate wealth of their more fortunate brethren. It is this inequality, and the desire consequently excited to *move* to the wealthier endowments that gives to the bishops their political *animus*, and renders them the most self-seeking-men in the country. Without translations they would be as independent in their conduct as the judges are said to be; but with the help of them Ministers are always able to keep a phalanx of votes at their absolute disposal. The influence of this temptation has been strikingly evinced in the history of Catholic Emancipation. So long as this salutary measure was opposed by the ministers, it was opposed by the whole of the bishops, with the exception of the Bishop of Norwich; but when the Duke of Wellington became premier, and the Catholic Relief Bill made a government measure, then the right reverend prelates opened their eyes to its justice and policy, and ten of them actually voted in its favour.

Another great improvement in the prelacy would consist in the *abolition of patronage*. As it is, a rigid discharge of their duties is often incompatible with their interests, or at least their feelings. Their proper functions are the superintendence of the subaltern clergy of their dioceses; but many of these clergy have been promoted by themselves to their benefices; they are their very good friends, and not a few their own flesh and blood. How, in such cases, can it be expected they will be strict in the enforcement of pastoral duties; that they will not be

indulgent in the granting of licenses for non-residence, and dispensations for pluralities; or that they will insist on the payment of suitable stipends to the curates. A bishop, like a pope, ought to have *no relations*, and thus escape, as Benedict II. remarked of the successors of St. Peter, the opprobrium of perverting the patronage of the church to the aggrandizement of his family. Under the existing system the chopping, exchanging, bargaining, and moving about, that ensue in a diocese on a translation or consecration, are a disgrace to the church, and render the discharge of episcopal duties more like a game on the chess-board, in which the *rooks*, *knights*, and other prime pieces, represent the “kit and kin” of the new diocesan.

The advantages that would result to the nation from church reform are immense. In the first place the abolition of non-residence, of pluralities, of sinecure offices in cathedrals, and the reduction of extravagant incomes, and the substitution, in lieu of these abuses, an uniform and graduated rate of payment to the different order of ecclesiastics, proportioned to rank and duty, would not only effect a vast improvement in church discipline, but a saving of at least *seven millions* per annum of public income. Away then would go the *TITHES*,—the most unjust and impolitic impost the ingenuity of rulers ever devised for tormenting God’s creatures, and crippling national resources. Of course we do not mean the tithe would be *simply repealed*; that would be merely throwing so much additional rent into the pockets of the land-owners without benefiting the farmer or general consumer of his produce. The tithe is a tax, and forms part of the public income levied for public purposes. Its simple removal, without purchase or commutation, would only yield so much increase of revenue to be lavished on opera dancers and actresses; or dissipated in gaming-houses, in concerts, coteries, and grand dinners; or wasted at Paris, Florence, and Naples, and which had better continue to be spent, as much of it now is, by sinecure silk-aprons and non-resident pluralists, at Bath, Cheltenham, and Tonbridge.

No! no! the people are quite awake on this subject. They do not intend to throw the tithe-impost as a sop to the boroughmongers; that indeed would be returning good for evil with a vengeance; but they intend it as a means of relief to themselves. The measure they contemplate is the *sale of the tithe* outright to the landowner, or its commutation by a land-tax. This would be a real reform; the other is only delusion. With such a resource as church property would yield, all the rabble of taxes might be repealed which now weigh down to annihilation the springs and sources of industry, and oppress a man’s “house, even his heritage.” The farmers and working agriculturists would share in the general benefit, not only by an increase of profits and wages and the mitigation of public burthens, but also by the extinction of an inquisitorial impost, whose pressure augments with every increase in industry, skill, and capital.

Nothing can more pointedly illustrate the stagnating influence of our aristocratic institutions on the mind and energies of the community than

the continuance of the tithe-tax so long after its impolicy and injustice have been demonstrated. Even Mr. Pitt, who, throughout his political life was the slave of a paltry ambition for place, and the tool of a despicable faction, meditated its removal. It has been denounced by Bishop Watson, by Dr. Paley, by Burke, by Malthus, and every writer and statesman with the least pretension to intelligence and patriotism. It is supported by the example of no country in Europe. Though England swarms with separatists, and can hardly be said to have a national religion, yet, for the maintenance of one handful of spirituals, the whole nation is insulted and the operations of rural industry fettered and impeded.

Our neighbours, the Scotch, have long since wiped out this abominable stain. Among them tithe is a valued and commuted rate of payment, forming a trifling and invariable impost, to the extent of which, alone, the landlord can ever be made liable to the church. This reform they commenced about the time they got rid of prelacy and cathedrals, in the days of JOHN KNOX. With this superiority Scotland would be the land to live in, were it not for her rag-money, her myriads of *legalists* and placemen, her host of servile writers, the barrenness of her moors and mountains, and the griping keenness of her population. "Strange as it may seem," says Mr. BROUGHAM, in one of his eloquent harangues, "and to many who hear me incredible, from one end of the kingdom to the other, a traveller will see no such thing as a bishop—not such a thing is to be found from the Tweed to John o'Groats: not a mitre, no nor so much as a minor canon, or even a rural dean—and in all the land not a single curate—so entirely rude and barbarous are they in Scotland—in such utter darkness do they sit that they support no cathedrals, maintain no pluralists, suffer no non-residence; nay, the poor benighted creatures are ignorant even of tithes! Not a sheaf, or a lamb, or a pig, or the value of a plough-penny, do the hopeless mortals render from year's end to year's end! Piteous as their lot is, what makes it infinitely more touching is to witness the return of good for evil, in the demeanour of this wretched race. Under all this cruel neglect of their spiritual concerns, they are actually the most loyal, contented, moral, and religious people any where, perhaps, to be found in the world."*

Bishop Watson, said "a reformer, of Luther's temper and talents, would, in five years, persuade the people to compel parliament to abolish tithes, to extinguish pluralities, to enforce residence, to confine episcopacy to the overseeing of dioceses, to expunge the Athanasian creed from our Liturgy, to free dissenters from Test-Acts, and the

* Trial of John Ambrose Williams, for a libel on the Clergy of Durham, Aug. 16th, 1822, p. 43. The defendant had given umbrage to the haughty clergy of the Palatinate by commenting, in a newspaper, on their servile conduct in prohibiting the bells to be tolled on the occasion of the death of the unfortunate Queen of George IV.

ministers of the establishment from subscription to human articles of faith."—*Letter to the Duke of Grafton*.

Mr. Burke said, he "wished ministers to preach the gospel with ease, but their possessions to be such that the pastor would not have the inauspicious appearance of a tax-gatherer."—*His Works*, vol. x. p. 146.

The progress of public reform is at a snail's pace, and so numerous and strong are the holds of abuse, that many pitched battles have to be fought before a single inch can be gained from the waste of corruption. But the interests identified with a reform of the church are so many, important, and self-evident, that we feel certain it is a measure that cannot be much longer averted.* Bishop Blomfield, we are sure, may save himself the trouble of putting forward, his cunningly-devised scheme for commuting tithes, for a limited period, at a fixed rate of payment. The country will never sanction any plan tending to give permanency to an odious impost which, to our great opprobrium, has long been suffered to survive the natural term of its existence. The worthy prelate seems to feel that the foundations of Mother Church are giving way, and he, doubtless, deems it good foresight in himself and brethren to lay hold of something certain for at least the next twenty years, the probable term of their earthly pilgrimage. But he may rely upon it the landlords, in England, will not be so easily overcome by ecclesiastical artifice as some of them have been in Ireland: a man must be totally regardless of the aspect of the times, he can know nothing of the state of opinion, as indicated by private conversations, by proceedings at public meetings, by newspapers, by parliamentary debates, by the petitions from Rochester, Devonshire, and other parts of the kingdom, who is not convinced that tithes, seven years hence, will neither impoverish the soil nor reproach the wisdom of domestic policy: the attention of the people is rivetted on the vast possessions of the church, and to them they look as the best resource in their privations and difficulties. In the language of Scripture, and of the followers of Sir Walter Raleigh, they may truly exclaim, "Come hither, all ye that are heavily laden,—Here is the real *El Dorado* for reducing the boroughmongers' debt, and lightening the burden of taxation. Here is the fund for colonizing, for mitigating poor-rates, repealing corn-laws, and creating employment; and none but fools look for any other!"

Considering, then, a great bettering in the condition of the operative clergy,—the improvement of church discipline,—the abolition of tithes,—and the saving of many millions of public income, as the certain and

* The fate of Lord Mountcashel's motion for an inquiry into the state of the United Church, last session, was not a little singular. It was fairly *cushioned* by their high mightinesses; it had not even a seconder, nor did a single lord, spiritual or temporal, vouchsafe an observation upon it, but in silent horror they unanimously agreed to stifle the hateful monster on its first obtrusion to light. His lordship's motion was so unhappily framed, it was not calculated to meet the views of any party; it neither suited the sly worshippers of the SUN, at Kensington, nor the devout adorers of NOX, at Clumber.

prominent advantages of ecclesiastical reformation,—we will next advert to one or two interests in society which, at first sight, appear to present some obstruction to this salutary revolution.

First, of the rights of *lay-impropriators*. It is necessary to bear in mind the distinction which has been before adverted to between the tithes of the church and the tithes of laymen. These last are considerable, amounting, perhaps, to one-fourth or one-fifth of the whole tithes of the kingdom. They have been estimated—though, we think, on incorrect principles—to be worth £1,752,842 per annum.* Now, these tithes are unquestionably of the nature of *private property*, and bear no analogy to clerical tithes. How they originated has been explained, (page 12,) but that has no bearing on their present tenure. We must take things as we find them, and adopt such rights of property as the laws and usages of society recognize, without ascending to their remote origin. Upon this principle we quickly discern the different tenure of church and impropriate tithes. The former have always been dealt with as a portion of the public income, payable to certain persons while engaged in the service of such form of worship as the State choose to patronize; the latter has been considered a rent-charge due to individuals, and with which the legislature had no concern. Hence the parliament has no more thought of interfering with impropriate tithes than with the estates in land obtained at the Reformation. The tithe-owner has dealt with them as part of his patrimony, which he could rightfully sell or devise to whom he pleased, and which immunities of ownership have been shown not to appertain to ecclesiastical possessions. To sequestrate lay-tithes would be gross spoliation, but, in the secularization of church-property, the legislature would only exercise an authority it has always possessed; and, were the life-interests of present possessors fairly commuted, neither loss nor injustice would be sustained by any person. It follows, impropriate tithes do not at all enter into the question of church reform; they must continue a charge on land, or lands liable thereto may be exonerated on such terms as can be agreed upon by the landlords and lay-impropriators.

Next, as to the interests of *private patrons* in advowsons. A right of presentation, in its origin and in acts of the legislature, has been shown to have been always considered merely an *honorary* function, which ought not be exercised for gain or family interests, but the promotion of religion and virtue. Private patrons, therefore, could not expect to be indemnified for the loss they would sustain by ecclesiastical reform, according to the present value of benefices. All they could expect would be the continuance to them (as was the case in Scotland) of the right of nominating the ministers of the Reformed Church, subject, as at present, to the approval of the bishop. For the public to purchase their interests, according to the present value of tithes and church-fees, would be nothing less than an act of NATIONAL SIMONY;

* Quarterly Review, vol. xxix. p. 556.

it would be converting a spiritual function into a temporal possession, and the state committing the very crime in wholesale which had been condemned and punished when perpetrated in a less degree by individuals.

Nothing has yet been said of the provision for the Established Clergy, to be substituted in lieu of tithes and church estates,—whether they are to be paid stipends by Government, or out of the poor-rates, the county-rate, or some other rate levied expressly for the purpose. The discussion of this matter will be time enough, when the people, or their representatives, have determined upon the secularization of church property. The proceedings of the Church-building Commissioners offer an example which some may think it wise to follow. They have shown not only how episcopalian churches may be built by subscription, but how the minister's stipend may be paid out of pew-rents, and other voluntary contributions, without the aid of the compulsory and odious provision of tithes. It may be thought a similar plan might be extended to all the churches of the establishment; but, for our parts, we are in favour of a national religion—a Liturgy—and an endowed clergy; provided the endowment is moderate—fairly apportioned among the working clergy—and does not exceed about a million and a half per annum. A public worship protected by the state has formed, with few exceptions, a part of every well-ordered community. The French *tried* to do without it; the experiment was productive of enormous crimes, and after floundering for a time in the waves of anarchy, they were compelled again to resort to the aid of spiritual faith. Religion contains now little to give offence to the most liberal mind; it is not, as formerly, like the demon of some German story—recluse, bloody, and unrelenting; its worst features—bigotry and intolerance—have been removed by the progress of science and philosophy, and what remains may be considered a good with scarcely any admixture of evil.

Whether, however, we have an endowed clergy or not, no fear need be entertained about the interests of religion suffering. The fear at present is all the other way, lest a people evidently verging into the gloom of *puritanism*, may not afterwards recoil into the opposite extreme of licentiousness and unbelief. This has been termed an age of *cant*, and every thing tends to show its ascendancy. Nothing but cant can live in literature, the drama, trade, or politics. Let any one deny the popular faith, and the doors of the Legislature are closed upon him; he is a “doomed man,” whose future life is “bound in storms and shallows,” and he is shunned as if he had caught the plague from some infectious lazaretto. This is the state of opinion among the lower and middle orders; among the higher, there is less scrupulosity; and a lord or a gentleman of £10,000 a year may admire Voltaire, Diderot, or Spinoza, without being ejected out of the pale of social communion.

While men's fortunes depend on their faith, we may be sure there will be enough of it, or at least, the profession. Like the French satirist, every one thinks it necessary *he should live*, and of course will adopt the means essential to the end in view. It is possible, however,

the artificial encouragement of devotion may produce it in excess, beyond the wants of the state, and thus generate the extreme to which we have adverted at the Restoration of Charles II. There is always some danger in meddling with spiritual opinions as with temporal interests; and many may think the wisest course to be adopted towards religion would be to follow the policy recently become popular in respect of trade — *leaving it free*; neither attempting to depress one sect by the drawback of civil disabilities, nor to encourage another by the bounty of protection. It is certainly a fact that religion will generally abound in proportion to the wants and demands of society; where there is much ignorance and mental debility, there will, as there ought, be much faith; on the other hand, where there is a strong and enlightened reason, the motives for good conduct will be sufficiently apparent, without being aided by the hopes and fears of superstition.

However, as before hinted, we are not the partizans of a *free-trade in religion*, and think a worship patronized by the state is best, provided *it be cheap*. Our reason for this preference may be somewhat peculiar, and not shared in by our readers. We prefer an established worship, not less as a means of maintaining a rational piety, than as a counterpoise to fanaticism. Without religion at all, men are seldom better than beasts; but if their rulers have no control over the popular faith, the people will be at the mercy of every pretender, whose warm imagination or an over-weening conceit may have filled with the delusion of a divine commission. With an endowed corps of ecclesiastics the state possesses a medium through which religion may be kept in countenance among the higher classes, (adopting the slang of aristocracy,) and its temperature among the lower be regulated. Of course we mean a race of clergymen differently qualified from the present. These, good easy souls! have little influence or authority; they have ministered away their flocks, and remain themselves objects of derision or cupidity, not veneration.

With the near and long-standing example of the Presbyterian establishment, North of the Tweed, it is surprising the task of ecclesiastical reform has made no progress either in England or Ireland. In the Kirk of Scotland, it has been already remarked, there are no bishops, nor dignitaries, nor tithes. The incomes of the national clergy are paid by the Court of Session out of a fund formed from the ancient tithes of the country. Some of the benefices being considered of too small value, they were, in 1810, augmented by an annual grant, from Parliament, of £10,000, which made the poorest livings worth £150 a-year, and the income of some of the ministers are considerably more, amounting to £300 or £350. Exclusive of house and glebe, the average income of the clergy is £245, which to 948 pastors, makes the whole annual expenditure on the Kirk only £234,900. This cannot be considered extravagant to a ministry with upwards of a *million and a half of hearers*; and upon the whole there are many things to admire in the Scotch Establishment. The Scots do not pay a quarter of a million for *lawn-sleeves*; nor half a million for cathedral and collegiate sinecurists.

There are no curates; the parochial clergy reside upon their benefices; exhorting, catechising, instructing, and performing all those duties to their parishioners, for which they receive their incomes. The Scotch Church, though it cannot now be termed *poor*, yet its wealth is not so exorbitant as to corrupt its ministry. The wealth of the English Church is the source of all its vices—sinecurism, pride, luxury, and inefficiency.

We have now finished our exposition of the Church of England, and can truly say we have nothing extenuated, nor “set down aught in malice.” Our statements we know cannot be impugned; but it is possible our opinions may be misunderstood. It may be thought we are Jacobins, Liberals, or worse. Of this we take no note, knowing we are as good subjects as true Christians. We have no dislike to the Church, but we hate its oppressiveness on the honest and industrious. Our humble endeavour has been to expose its corruptions. If the duties of the Church be of importance to Government, or to the interests of morality, it is a strong reason for reforming, not protecting its abuses. It must be clear to the most common observer it cannot long continue in its present state. Without adverting to defects in discipline,—the Liturgy—ill-proportioned revenue—or the conduct of the clergy themselves, the mere fact of a body of men, not exceeding *eight thousand* in number, and of no great social importance—claiming in the most vexatious manner a tenth of the natural and artificial produce of a soil, raised for the support of **FOURTEEN MILLIONS**, is so staringly outrageous, as to throw all argument out of court, and leave the Church a barefaced and unparalleled oppression, without precedent or palliative. Further reasoning on such a subject is out of place, and the only question is—Who will rise to abate the colossal nuisance? Will Government timely interfere and afford the Church a chance of prolonged duration, under a less obnoxious form, or will it supinely wait and behold it swept off in a whirlwind, leaving “not a wreck behind,” by a simultaneous rush of the *tiers état*?

* * * *For a Statement of the Incomes of the Bishopricks and Dignitaries and a List of Pluralists, in the Church of England—see the APPENDIX.*

THE

CHURCH OF IRELAND.

HAVING, in the preceding article, given a detailed account of the general principles and management of the Church of England, it will not be requisite to be equally copious in our exposition of the Irish Protestant establishment.

In the past and present state of Ireland we have a striking illustration of the tendency of the government that is said to "*work well*," and the wretchedness of her population, her tithe-system, her vast tracts of land, either ill-cultivated or totally unproductive, her judicial and magisterial administration, her insurrections, factions, burnings, desolations, and bloody domestic outrages,—all symptomatic of a community entering on the first stages of civilization,—afford irrefragable proof of the excellencies of the good working government. In England, it is true, there are grievous abuses in the absorption of public money by the Aristocracy, in the denial of justice by the cost and uncertainty of legal decisions, in the game-laws, corn-laws, partial taxation, and other oppressions;—but these sink into insignificance when contrasted with the sufferings of Ireland. There the natural order of society has been inverted, and the government for many years has existed, not for the benefit of the people, but the people existed solely for the benefit of the government.

Among the various forms under which oppression is carried on, the most conspicuous is the Church Establishment; one is at a loss to conceive for whose benefit this institution exists in Ireland. Is it for the benefit of the clergy, the people, or the state? If by the former is meant those who minister religious instruction, it can hardly be said to be of advantage to them. The teachers of religion in Ireland are nearly all Catholics, a vast majority of the people are of the same persuasion, and what religion there is the expense is defrayed by voluntary contributions. Neither the really operative clergy, therefore, nor the people, benefit by the church establishment. With respect to the state, the advantage appears not less equivocal. The alliance betwixt *church* and

state is founded on reciprocal benefits—that, on the one hand, the state shall give its civil protection to the church, and, on the other, the church shall aid in sustaining the state, by its influence over the people:—this is the basis of the compact; and it follows, when the church loses its influence, when it loses the adherence of a majority of the population, when it is no longer able to sustain the state, the compact is dissolved; it has no claim for protection, and its alliance becomes a source of weakness instead of power.

Such is the actual condition of the Irish church, such the advantages it confers on the government; it adds little to its authority, affords no aid to the civil magistrate, neither the law nor its ministers are rendered more sacred by its influence—quite the reverse. Authority is degraded and abhorred in Ireland, solely on account of the ecclesiastical establishment: it is the colossal grievance of the country, the source of all its factions, murmuring, and discontent. Why then, it may be asked, is the establishment maintained? On what principle or pretext is it justified? The godly cannot defend it from piety, the politician from reasons of state, nor the patriot for the blessings it confers on the community. Whose interest, then, is identified with the odious system? The only rational answer that can be given to this question is the fact, that there is, in Ireland, as in this country, an *oligarchical interest*, which has entwined itself round her institutions, and whose support is incompatible with public liberty and happiness. For many years Ireland was the prey of a favoured caste, a selfish and bigotted faction, who divided her as a spoil; and such was the wretched policy of the general government, that it was weak and unprincipled enough to avail itself of the folly and cupidity of such agents to preserve a precarious sovereignty—when, too, its frown would have made the same creatures, who were ready, at any time, to sacrifice their country for a pension or a place, instrumental to her greatness and welfare. Under the Wellington administration attempts have been made to introduce a more impartial and enlightened system; with what success time must develope; but it is apparent, so long as her ecclesiastical establishment is continued—it is vain to expect contentment and tranquillity.

The Irish branch of the United Church is more pregnant with abuses even than its sister establishment in England; presenting a more revolting spectacle of inordinate incomes, of lax discipline, of laborious duties without adequate remuneration, and of an immense ecclesiastical revenue levied under circumstances of greater insult, partiality, and oppression. The points most deserving attention in the exposition of these subjects are, *first*, the revenue of the Irish Protestant establishment; *secondly*, the number of individuals among whom this revenue is divided; *thirdly*, the hardships and impoverishment resulting not less from the amount than the mode in which the clerical income is levied; *fourthly*, the patronage of the Irish church; *lastly*, the diminutive portion of the population who derive even a semblance of benefit from the intolerable burthen imposed on the land and industry of the

community. We shall touch on these several heads of inquiry as briefly as possible, confining ourselves strictly to such facts as illustrate the state of the church.

To begin with our first topic—the Irish Church Revenue. Within the last ten years a mass of important details has been laid before parliament, relative to the estates and revenues of the Protestant establishment; but, either from inability or reluctance in the parties interested to communicate the requisite information, our knowledge is still far from complete and accurate on this interesting branch of public statistics. Upon the authority of documents so communicated we shall, however, in great part, found our exposition; and thus, by relying on the statements of the clergy themselves, their registrars, and other dependent officials, we shall at least avoid the imputation of having arrived, through a prejudiced medium, at an exaggerated result.

We shall commence with the revenues of the *Episcopal Clergy*. The incomes of the bishops are derived principally from land, but partly from tithe. In some dioceses, in the West of Ireland, a *fourth part of the tithes* of almost every parish is paid to the bishop; affording decisive testimony of the ancient fourfold division of parochial tithes, and of the veracity of the allegation of those who affirm that the poor were formerly entitled to share equally with the bishop and priest in the produce of this impost. The practice, however, is not universal; and the revenues of the bishoprics chiefly arise from their immense landed estates. In the session of 1824, returns were made to parliament of the number of acres attached to the several Irish sees.* These returns are very incomplete, and were mostly compiled by the registrars from the fallacious representations of the tenantry. Three dioceses, Dromore, Down, and Raphoe, made no return at all; alleging that, on examining the leases of the church lands, it was found they did not mention “*the number of acres demised.*” In the return from Armagh, it is remarked that the number of acres has been calculated from the representations of the tenants, but “*the lands have never been surveyed.*” Of the magnitude of the errors in these reports, we may judge from the fact subsequently ascertained, that, in one of them, there was a trifling omission of *thirteen thousand acres*. Enough, however, may be collected from them to show the vast extent of ecclesiastical property: in fact, it is clear that the bishops’ lands are held, leased, and managed much upon the same liberal scale and principle that lands are in Australia, Canada, and Nova Scotia; and the conjectural estimates by Wakefield, and other statist, of what their immense incomes, either actually are, or might be made, under an improved system of tenure and cultivation, are not remote from the truth. We shall insert the number of acres returned by fourteen sees; the acres are Irish, which makes the amount about one-third less than it would be in English acres.

* Parliamentary Papers, vol. xxi. Session 1824.

Number of Acres of Land belonging to fourteen Irish Sees.

Name.	See.	Quantity of See-Lands.
<i>John George Beresford, D.D.</i>	Armagh	63,270
<i>Power Le Poer Trench, D.D.</i>	Tuam	49,281
<i>William Knox, D.D.</i>	Derry	94,836
<i>John Leslie, D.D.</i>	Elphin	31,832
<i>James Verschoyle, D.D.</i>	Killala	34,672
<i>Robert Tottenham, D.D.</i>	Clogher	27,070
<i>Nathaniel Alexander, D.D.</i>	Meath	18,374
<i>George De la Poer Beresford, D.D.</i>	Kilmore	47,361
<i>William Magee, D.D.</i>	Dublin	21,781
<i>Thomas St. Laurence, D.D.</i>	Cork and Ross	22,755
<i>John Brinkley, D.D.</i>	Cloyne	15,871
<i>Richard Lawrence, D.C.L.</i>	Cashel	13,392
<i>Robert Fowler, D.D.</i>	Ossory	13,391
<i>Richard Bourke, D.D.</i>	Waterford	9,996

Total, in Irish acres463,962*

Mr. Leslie Foster, one of the barons of the Irish exchequer, estimates the lands belonging to *all* the sees to amount to 617,598 Irish acres, which are equal to about 990,000 English acres.† This does not include the demesne lands attached to the episcopal residences, and which, by the same authority, are said to vary from 100 to 500 acres each; making the entire patrimony of the bishops about 623,598 acres; or, according to Beaufort's map of Ireland, one nineteenth of the entire soil of the kingdom. This, it must be allowed, is enough for the maintenance of twenty-two bishops, especially when it is considered a population of *eight millions* is to be supported out of the remainder.

However, the area grasped by the right reverend fathers affords an inaccurate idea of their incomes. Mr. Baron Foster supposes the average value of the see-lands to be 20s. per acre. Even at this low rate, the bishops' lands, if out of lease, would yield a total revenue of £623,598, averaging £28,340 to each prelate. Some of the wealthier sees, as those of Derry, Armagh, Tuam, and Elphin, would have incomes, respectively, of £94,836, £63,270, £49,281, and £31,832, exclusive of what might be derived from tithes, patronage, and other sources. But the nature of ecclesiastical tenures precludes the bishops from realizing incomes to this amount. It scarcely ever happens the occupying tenantry are the bishops' tenants; the immediate lessees hold from the bishops for the term of 21 years; the bishops renew the leases from year to year, always leaving 21 years unexpired; the rent reserved

* Parliamentary Papers, vol. xxi. No. 402, Session 1824.

† Parliamentary Papers, vol. ix. page 75, Session 1825.

to the bishops is mostly the old rent payable in the time of Charles II., which has become almost nominal, and the real incomes of the bishops proceed from the *annual fines* for renewing the leases. Now these fines usually amount to about one-fifth of what an ordinary landlord would receive for rent. So that, if the actual worth of the see lands be £623,598, the sum ordinarily received does not exceed £124,719.

We have thought it expedient to explain this, because it is a subject on which there has been a great deal of misapprehension. The fact is, the spiritual tenures are one great obstacle to agricultural improvement in Ireland. The Church is a principal proprietor of the soil, but the vast tracts she holds can never be cultivated to advantage under the uncertainties of the existing system. Much of the land is rough pasture, bog, and mountain, which requires, in the first instance, a great expenditure to render productive; but who would risk capital in the undertaking with a lease which, by law, cannot *exceed twenty-one years*; or with a certainty of having a fine levied on its renewal, augmented in exact proportion to the money and labour expended in improvement? Again, an ecclesiastical tenant is never sure of his landlord, being constantly liable to be changed not only by death but translation. New lords, as the proverb says, often bring new laws. Although the usual course is to renew every year at one-fifth of the real worth, yet some prelates act differently; they will have surveys made—demand exorbitant fines—or wait the fall of the leases, which are relet at a nominal rent, perhaps, to their own relations. From these causes arises the non-improvement uniformly remarked in the condition of the church lands. It is a great obstacle to the public prosperity of Ireland, and the practice is as little favourable to the interests of the bishops as to those of the lessees, by rendering the incomes of the former not only less than they otherwise would be, but uncertain, varying, as they do, with the amount of the fines, or perhaps they lose the fines altogether, the tenants electing to run out their leases, and thus the advantage stands over to the succeeding diocesan.

In spite of these drawbacks, the bishops, from estates, tithes, brokerage in livings and other means, contrive to make a very profitable crusade. Upon no less authority than the *Edinburgh Review* (vol. xliii. p. 483) their incomes are stated to average £10,000 a year each, or £220,000 in the whole. The patronage of an Irish bishop, of which we shall hereafter speak, is nearly as valuable as the income of his see. The vast revenues appendant to the bishoprics may be inferred from the immense wealth the prelates leave behind them. A former Bishop of Clogher, (the predecessor of the soldier-bishop,) who had been Cambridge tutor to Lord Westmorland, went over to Ireland without a shilling, and continued in his bishopric for eight years, and, at the end of that time, died worth between £300,000 and £400,000. It was stated, by Sir John Newport,* that three bishops, in the last fifteen years, had left the enormous sum of £700,000 to their families.

* Parliamentary Debates, vol. viii. p. 837.

Of the extent of the estates of the *Deans and Chapters*, we have no means of forming an estimate, there having been no return laid before parliament of the real property of the ecclesiastical corporations. Many of the dignities as well as the sees are known to be extremely valuable. The Deanery of Down, for example, in 1790, was worth £2000 per annum; in 1810, it let for £3700.* By comparing the cathedral and collegiate establishments of Ireland with those of England, it may, perhaps, be possible to form a conjecture of their relative value. In England the income of the Deans and Chapters is £494,000; but, as the number of members of these corporations is double what it is in Ireland, it is probable their endowments exceed in the same proportion. We may, therefore, conclude that the Deans and Chapters have estates and endowments a little exceeding those of the Irish Bishopsrics, and producing a total revenue of £250,000 per annum.

Next in order let us advert to the incomes of the *Parochial Clergy*, from tithes and glebe. Ireland contains 18,000,000 of English acres of land, of which 900,000 pay nothing to the church; 4,000,000 pay from endowments about one-third of their tithes, and the remaining 13,000,000 and upwards are liable to pay full tithes. The share which the clergy actually derive from the soil will be best ascertained from the valuations of the Tithe Commissioners, acting under the authority of Mr. Goulburn's statute. Compositions under this act continue in force twenty-one years when *the original right to tithes revives*, and vary in amount every third year, if the average price of wheat or oats fluctuates one-tenth.† Had this act been exclusively framed by a conclave of tithe-eaters, it could not have more adroitly guaranteed their interests; and this is strikingly exemplified by the provision which provides that the tenant may deduct his share of the composition from the landlord's rent, and, if in arrear, it must be paid in preference to *debt, rent, or taxes*—that is, the parson's claim must have priority of that of a creditor, the landlord, or even the KING. It is a most cunningly devised measure for perpetuating, without lightening, a most grievous burden. A design is entertained by the Heads of the Church to introduce a similar project into England, but we trust the intention will be frustrated. Its direct tendency is to fasten on the community the tithe-tax like the land-tax; with this difference, that the latter is paid by the landlord, but the former would have to be paid by the tenants, and augment with every increase in capital and industry. Its tendency is also to make the pastors completely independent of their congregations, converting the former into annuitants who derive their incomes as independently of their parishioners as if paid out of the public treasury. The motives for residence will be still further lessened; many parsons before, from having few or no hearers, had little inducement, from the claims of duty, to reside on their livings, but now they will not even have the tithes to look after,—no need of watching the

* Wakefield's Statistical Account of Ireland, p. 469.

† The Composition-Act, 4 Geo. IV. c. 99, s. 43.

growth of potatoes, the increase of farm stock, nor extension of tillage; their composition-money, like the rent of the absentee-landlord, may be remitted whole and entire to them at London, Paris, Bath, or whatever place they may select as best calculated for unobserved luxurious indulgence.

However, let us attend to the *workings* of this precious scheme of Lord Wellesley's Irish administration, and the light it throws on the value of parochial tithes. But first we must give the reader an idea of the rapacious manner in which church-preferment has been cut up in Ireland; how the parishes have been compressed into unions; how the unions have been dove-tailed into enormous pluralities; how the pluralities and unions together have been tacked to dignities and offices; and how all these good things, like so many bunches of grapes on a string, have been heaped on the Beresfords, Laurences, Saurins, and Plunkets, as the price of impoverishing and oppressing the Irish peasant.

Be it known, then, that there are in Ireland 2450 parishes. Now, as no parish (though some districts or portions of land are) is wholly exempt from the payment of tithes, each parish ought to have at least one resident minister, one church, one parsonage-house, and one glebe. This is the ecclesiastical state which ought to subsist. Instead of which there are only, according to clerical authority, *one thousand and seventy-five* rectors, vicars, and perpetual curates in all Ireland, and of these not more than two-thirds are said to reside on their benefices.* In the whole 2450 parishes there are only 1100 churches, and of these churches 474 have been built within the last century by means of grants of *public money*. There are only 771 glebe-houses, and though there are some benefices with two or three glebes, containing 4000 acres, there are many parishes without any glebe at all, the land, through negligence or abuse, having been lost or alienated, it not being unusual to find a patch of ground, designated as glebe, situate in the middle of a gentleman's lawn or part of his demesne, to which he lays claim in virtue of some patent right, granting him the lands and tenements of a church for ever. It follows from this that there are more than three parishes to every resident incumbent; there is less than one church to every two parishes; and, if every parish had its pastor, as it ought, there would be nearly four parsons to live in every glebe-house.

To accommodate these dilapidations and inconsistencies the policy of consolidating the parishes into UNIONS has been resorted to. As in many parishes there were neither hearers nor a church there could be no need of the services of an officiating minister. In these parishes it would have been *rational* either to have abolished the tithe or applied the produce of it to some other purpose than the support of a sinecure rector or vicar. But this did not accord with the temporal interests of the church. Hence the expedient of unions of parishes; that is, clusters of parishes, in various numbers, from two to a dozen and more,

* Ecclesiastical Register of Ireland for 1830, p. 33.

have been compressed into a *single* benefice, forming one presentation, held by a single incumbent, and this incumbent, perhaps, a pluralist, holding two or more of these ecclesiastical conglomerations. In England a similar abuse prevails; it frequently happening that two or more rectories, vicarages, or parochial chapelries are held *cum*, or with, others, forming a single benefice; but the instances are neither so numerous nor outrageous as in Ireland. In the latter country unions may be found thirty-six Irish miles in length, containing as many square miles of territory as some of the petty kingdoms under the Heptarchy. One union, that of Burnchurch, in the diocese of Ossory, formed by an act of the privy council, and in the gift of the king and the bishop alternately, consists of no fewer than *thirteen parishes*. Here is a benefice! If a man is fortunate enough to obtain, as is not impossible, two or three such benefices, he is more like a bishop at the head of a diocese than a parish priest.

Of the whole 2450 parishes there are only 749 held *single*, the remaining 1701 parishes having been consolidated into 517 unions, forming, in the whole, 1266 parochial benefices. The territorial contents of the benefices vary in different districts. According to Mr. Erck, in the northern, southern, and eastern provinces, they average 6544 Irish acres, or upwards of ten square miles, with the exception of those in the dioceses of Clogher and Killaloe, and in the three western dioceses of Elphin, Clonfert, and Killala, where they average from 10 to 12,000 acres; in the dioceses of Derry, Kilmore, Raphoe, Ardfert, and Achonry, they average from 12 to 15,000 acres; and in the western diocese of Tuam they average the enormous area of 25,800 acres. The union benefices have been constituted under different authorities, by parliament, by charter, by act of council, by license of the bishops; and some are of such ancient date that the period and mode of their origin cannot be traced. All the unions are permanent except those under episcopal authority, which enure only during the life of the incumbent, when the parishes may revert to their original state. But if an union has been once formed it is generally continued to successive incumbents, and it is not likely the bishops will dissolve them, especially if they happen to be, as is mostly the case, the patrons. In fact, it is by the heads of the church, whose duty consisted in the maintenance of more strict ecclesiastical discipline, that the abuse of unions has been chiefly encouraged. Of the 517 unions 230 are of episcopal creation, and 126 more have been established under an authority almost identical with that of the bishops,—namely, the privy council of Ireland. We subjoin a classification of the unions now subsisting, as we collect them from the *Ecclesiastical Register* for 1830, pp. 14, 15.* So long

* This work is by John C. Erck, A.M., LL.B. and published in Dublin. It is an elaborate and well-compiled performance, abounding in much curious and useful information, of great interest to those enjoying and aspiring to ecclesiastical emoluments; but, having been edited under the sanction of the Board of First Fruits, the Editor has been careful not to afford the slightest glimpse of the discipline and immense amount and mal-administration of the revenues of the Irish church.

established and intimately cemented have some of these unions become, that the boundaries of the parishes of which they consist it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to trace; and there are among the apologists of ecclesiastical abuses those who would avail themselves of this circumstance, and boldly affirm that the parishes in some unions are not distinct parishes, only *town lands*, and this though the denomination and names of the parishes are fully set forth in the titles of every incumbent!

A Statement exhibiting the Number of Unions, the Number of Parishes in each, and their Denominations.

Number of Parishes in each Union.	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	Total of Benefices.	Total of Parishes.
Parliamentary Unions	2	4	1		3							10	38
Charter Unions	5	8	4	3	3	1	1					25	98
Act of Council Unions	46	34	19	12	7	2	4	1			1	126	440
Episcopal Unions	119	51	29	16	5	3	3		2	2		230	704
Immemorial Unions	49	34	18	13	5	5		1	1			126	421
Total..	221	131	71	44	23	11	8	2	3	2	1	517	1701

Having explained the nature of unions and their territorial magnitude, the reader will be better enabled to judge of the value of Irish benefices, and he must be convinced what a fortunate aspirant he must be who happens to be presented with two or more such benefices, besides dignities and offices, especially if he have not—as is possible—a church in any of them to preach in, nor a single Protestant to whom he need read prayers. Of the annual worth of a *portion* of the emoluments of many benefices we have authentic means of judging, from the returns laid before parliament, of the amount of the compositions for tithes in nearly one-half the whole number of parishes in Ireland. The returns ordered during last session we have not yet seen; but, from the latest preceding returns,* we learn that 1151 parishes had compounded for their lay and ecclesiastical tithes to the amount of £329,644. In Ireland, as in England, there is great disparity in the value of livings; some are extremely small and insignificant, while others, according to the admission of his grace of Armagh, are worth £2300 per annum. We are as averse to the penury of one part of the church as to the corruptive opulence of another; for we dislike all extremes of condition, and are quite of AGUR's opinion in thinking that neither excess of riches nor poverty is for the good of individuals. The list of parishes we subjoin has been taken almost at random from the Parliamentary Returns: it will show the actual sums now paid by parishes in lieu of tithes, and, as the UNIONS are enclosed in crotchets, it will be seen what monstrosities some of them are. The composition-money put down is for *clerical* tithes only; the amount paid for improper tithes is omitted, as not

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 269, Session 1828.

forming part of the income of the incumbent. In some unions all the parishes have not yet compounded; in others the compositions have been quashed by the bishops, (who have a veto on these agreements,) as not being adequate to their reputed value. The names of the patrons and present incumbents have been collected from the *Ecclesiastical Register* of Ireland.

Statement of the Sums agreed to be paid, under the Composition-Act, by several Parishes in lieu of Tithes, and the Names of the present Incumbents and Patrons.

[Those Parishes marked ‡ are not compounded for.]

Incumbent.	Patron.	Parish.	Amount of Composition.
Edward Hincks	<i>Trin. Col. Dublin</i>	Artrea	£738
Francis Hall	<i>Trin. Col. Dublin</i>	Arboe	507
Charles Atkinson	<i>Archb. Armagh</i>	Creggan	1050
Hon. C. Knox	<i>Archb. Armagh</i>	{ Carnteel	406
E. Stopford	<i>Archb. Armagh</i>	{ Anghaloo	609
G. Blacker	<i>Archb. Armagh</i>	Derrynoose	646
J. Campbell	<i>Archb. Armagh</i>	Drumcree	650
W. Pinching	<i>Bp. Clogher</i>	Forkhill	650
J. G. Porter	<i>Bp. Clogher</i>	Carrickmacross ..	646
W. Athill	<i>Bp. Clogher</i>	Donaghmoine ..	953*
		Findonagh	600
T. De Lacy	<i>Bp. Meath</i>	{ Kells	553
		{ Duleene	200
		{ Rathboyne	277
		{ Burry ‡	
W. Kellett	<i>The King</i>	Moynalty	550
W. Pratt	<i>Bp. Meath</i>	Enniskeen	900
R. Symes	<i>Bp. Connor</i>	Ballymoney	1015
A. Leslie	<i>The King</i>	Ahoghill	1015
G. Macartney	<i>Marq. Donegal</i>	{ Skerry	419
W. Knox	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	{ Racavan	295
A. Ross	{ <i>Skinner's Com.</i>	Ballynascreen ..	623
	{ <i>London</i>	{ Banagher	650
A. W. Pomeroy	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Bovevagh	580
J. W. Ormsby	<i>Trin. Col. Dublin</i>	Cappagh	1000
W. Knox	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Clonleigh	840
R. Babington	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Cumber Lower. ..	560

* The lay tithes of this parish have been compounded for £476, making the total amount of composition £1429 a-year.

Incumbent.	Patron.	Parish.	Amount of Composition.
F. Gouldsbury	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Cumber Upper ..	£740
A. T. Hamilton	<i>Marq. Abercorn</i> ..	Donagheady	1350
Sir J. Leighton	<i>The Lightons</i> ..	Donaghmore	1440
F. Brownlow	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Leekpatrick	646
J. S. Knox	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Magheara	1015
O. M. Causland	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Tamlaghfinlagan .	1000
J. Jones	<i>Bp. Derry</i>	Urney	700
R. Allott	<i>The King</i>	Raphoe	900*
J. Ussher	<i>Trin. Col. Dublin</i> ..	Raymochy	650
E. Bqwen	<i>Marq. Abercorn.</i> {	Taughboyne, } ..	1569
H. E. Boyd	<i>Bp. Dromore</i> ..	All Saints .. }	
G. Crawford	<i>Bp. Ardagh</i>	Drumaragh	937
W. Bourne	<i>Duke of Leinster</i> {	Clongesh	461
H. Joly	<i>Duke of Leinster</i> {	Killoe	535
J. D. Wingfield	<i>Lord Digby</i>	Rathangan	553
R. Vicars	<i>The King</i>	Clonsast.	628
Hon. J. Bourke	<i>The King</i>	Ballinakill	65
		Geashill	1292
		Coolbanagher	276
		Ardea	259
		Aghavoe	789
		Comer	969
		Callan	550
		Coolagh	383
G. Stevenson	<i>Marq. Ormonde</i> {	Tullomain	105
		Tullaroan †	
		Killaloe †	
		Ballycallan †	
J. B. Ridge	<i>The King</i>	Eirke	692
M. Monck	<i>Bp. Ossory</i>	Rathdowny	750
		Glashare †	
		Kildelgy †	
H. P. Elrington	<i>Bp. Ferns</i>	Templeshambo. ..	1200
		Kilmackclogue ...	234
P. Browne	<i>The King</i>	Magloss	55
		Kilkevan	369
		Kilnehue	465
W. Hore	<i>Bp. Ferns</i>	Kilrush	694
		Clone	332
M. Charters	<i>Bp. Ferns</i>	Kilbride	203
		Ferns	270†

* This is an union containing six more parishes, but as they have not compounded, their names are omitted.

† Ferns has compounded for its impropriate tithe for £553, making the annual sum payable by this parish for lay and ecclesiastical tithes £823.

Incumbent.	Patron.	Parish.	Amount of Composition.
H. Moore	<i>Bp. Ferns</i>	Carnew	£830
A. Lord	<i>Archb. Cashell</i>	{ Templetonhy	500
		{ Loughmore	249
		{ Another parish †	
		{ Killoscully	323
J. Pennefather	<i>Archb. Cashell</i>	{ Kilvolane	461
		{ Kilnerath	303
		{ Kilcomenty	323
T. P. Le Fann	<i>Bp. Emly</i>	{ Abington	650
C. P. Coote	<i>Bp. Emly</i>	{ Tough	250
W. Galway	<i>Bp. Emly</i>	{ Doon	830
		{ Kilmastulla	318
		{ Templeichally	406
		{ Castle Island	638
Lord Brandon	{ <i>Lordship of Cas-</i>	{ Ballyncushlane	460
	<i>tle Island</i>	{ Dysert	173
		{ Killentierna	283
		{ Ballynahaglish	230
		{ Anna	332
B. Denny	<i>Sir E. Denny</i>	{ Cloherbrien	332
		{ Caher	226
		{ Killencan	160
		{ Glanbeagh	130
Vicars Choral	<i>Vicars Choral</i>	{ Lismore †	
		{ Mocollop	1569
J. Scott	<i>The King</i>	{ Tubrid	955
		{ Ballybacon	461
		{ Moviddy	507
T. G. Laurence	<i>Bp. Cork</i>	{ Kilbonane	208
		{ Aglish	379
W. Harvey	<i>Bp. Cork</i>	{ Kilnaglory	325
		{ Athnowen	425
J. Jervois	<i>Bp. Cork</i>	{ Kilmichael	692
		{ Macloneigh	250
A. Trail	<i>The King & Bp.</i>	{ Skull	850
T. Kenny	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	{ Donoughmore	1100
Hon. G. de la P. Beresford	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	{ Inniscarra	636
		{ Malthy	513
J. Hingstone	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	{ Whitechurch	784
J. Hingstone	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	{ Aghabullogue	750
A. Champagne	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	{ Castleyons	571*
M. Purcell	<i>Fitzgerald</i>	{ Dungourney	664

* The lay-tithes of this parish have been compounded for £1142, making the yearly composition for impropriate and clerical tithes £1713.

Incumbent.	Patron.	Parish.	Amount of Composition.
T. Newenham	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	Kilworth	£170
		Macronev	230
		Leitrim	230
J. Lombard	<i>Bp. Cloyne</i>	Kilcrumper	220
E. Palmer	<i>Bp. Killaloe</i>	Kilshannick	738
		Modreeny	533
G. Holmes	<i>Bp. Killaloe</i>	Arderony	307
		Kilmore	323
		Kilnaneave	315
		Lisbonny	323
E. Price	<i>Bp. Killaloe</i>	Aglishecloghane ..	161
		Lorrha	438
		Dorrha	415

From the above statement it appears that the amount of composition-money paid in lieu of tithes, in some unions, amounts to £1410, £1407, £1554, £1569, and £1758; and that *single* parishes have come down to the tune of £1050, £1200, £1350, and £1440, in order to rid themselves of the secular visitations of the spiritual locust. These sums, it must be remembered, are not the conjectural estimates of individuals imperfectly informed of the worth of parochial tithes; they are public and authentic returns, founded on an average and impartial valuation. It must, also, be borne in mind that the composition is a net payment, obtained without the trouble of collecting the tithes, or the expense of proctors or middlemen, and the receipt of which is better secured than the landlord's rent or the public taxes.

Many of the incumbents enjoying these really fat livings are *pluralists*, holding other parochial benefices, beside dignities and offices. The names of the *honourable* Charles Knox, the *honourable* George de la Poer Beresford, the *honourable* Joseph Bourke, and other well-known signatures, are quite sufficient to indicate their connexions with the episcopacy and aristocracy of Ireland. It would require pages fully to set forth the families, connexions, and influence; the sinecures, places, offices, and pensions by which some of these *honourables* have sent forth their absorbents into the substance of Church and State. There is one man, however, JAMES HINGSTONE by name, who, as far as we know, is not of *noble blood*, unless it be by some left-handed tilt; yet he seems to have reaped a plentiful harvest. He has compounded for the tithes of two parishes, that of Whitechurch for £784, and that of Aghabullogue for £750, making a snug income of £1534 per annum. But this is far from being the extent of his endowments. He is, also, rector of Subulter, and prebendary and vicar-general of Cloyne. His son, James Hingstone, is vicar of Clonmult, and vicar-choral of the cathedral church of St. Colman's. It were easy to give similar illustration of the rest: but, to avoid repetition, we must reserve particulars to a subsequent *List of Irish Pluralists*.

Mr. Goulburn's *bait* has taken so well that it is probable, in a few

years more, all the parishes in Ireland will have compounded for their tithes: the progress of the measure, up to the present, will appear from the subjoined statement, exhibiting the number of parishes that have already compounded in the four provinces, the proportion between lay and ecclesiastical tithe, and the average composition of each parish:—

Provinces.	No. of Parishes.	Impropriate Tithe.	Church Tithe.	Total Lay and Church.	Average of each Parish.
Armagh ..	287	£12,308	£89,407	£101,716	£354
Dublin ..	248	13,813	55,709	69,522	280
Cashel ..	446	19,731	105,683	125,415	281
Tuam	170	5,751	27,237	32,989	195
Total ..	1151	51,603	278,036	329,642	286

From the results of the compositions already entered into it is easy to calculate the value of tithes in all Ireland. Of the 1151 parishes, the average rate of composition for each parish, for impropriate tithe, is £45:10, for church tithe £241, and for ecclesiastical and lay tithes together £286. Supposing the whole 2450 parishes to compound for tithes at the same average rate, the annual value of impropriate tithes is £101,475, of church tithes £590,450, making the total burden imposed by tithes, lay and ecclesiastical, on the entire kingdom, amount to £691,925 per annum.

But the ecclesiastical tithes of £590,450 per annum constitute only one item in the yearly emoluments of the parochial clergy. They have, also, glebe-houses, extensive glebes, minister's money, and church-fees. In Ireland, "all things seem oddly made and every thing amiss." Many benefices have neither glebe-house nor glebe-land; while others have two glebe-houses each, and two or more glebes, comprising a superficial area of 2000 acres. One-third of the benefices are destitute of any glebe whatever, and, consequently, of any residence; while the remaining two-thirds of the benefices are estimated to possess glebe-land to the enormous extent of 91,137 acres. Supposing, with Mr. Baron Foster, the glebe to be worth, on an average, only £1 per acre, it forms a very considerable addition to the yearly revenue of the beneficed clergy.

Another source of clerical emolument is that termed *minister's money*, intended as a substitute for tithes, and which, as we have no assessment levied in the same way in England, it will be proper to explain. In cities and towns corporate, where there are small or no tithes, a power is vested in the Lord Lieutenant, authorising, by a commission, valuations to be made, from time to time, of every house; upon a return of such valuations, in which no house may be *rated above* £60, the Lord Lieutenant and six more of the privy-council are

empowered to assess each house, in a yearly sum, for the maintenance of the incumbent. Under this authority valuations have been made of the parishes in the cities of Dublin, Cork, Waterford, and Limerick, and the towns corporate of Drogheda and Clonmel; and it is from the proceeds of these assessments that the incumbents of forty-eight city parishes are paid their stipends. We have not any public return of the incomes allotted to the ministers of these towns and parishes; if they average £500 each, it makes an addition of £25,000 a-year to the revenues of the parochial clergy. The clause which provides that no house shall be rated *above sixty pounds* originated, no doubt, in the same selfish policy that dictated the abolition of the tithe of pasture, and shows, in every measure, how scrupulously has been considered the interests of the wealthy Protestants, while the burden even of maintaining the established church of the ascendant party was thrown, with unequal weight, on their poor and politically-disfranchised catholic brethren.

The yearly sums derived from *church-fees* we can only conjecture. They do not, of course, from a vast majority of the population being separatists from the endowed worship, form so productive a source of emolument as in England. But, supposing the *million* of Protestants, in Ireland, pay for marriages, christenings, and burials only 5s. a-head, surplice-fees yield an income of £250,000. Without including, then, the emoluments derived by the parochial clergy from the dignities and offices they hold, from being masters of diocesan-schools, vicar-general or surrogate of a diocese, or official chaplain at the Castle; their total revenue, from the four sources of tithes, glebe-land, minister's money, and church-fees, cannot be less than £956,587. If to this sum we add the incomes of the episcopal clergy and the deans and chapters already ascertained, we shall have the total amount of the burden imposed on Ireland by its Protestant establishment as follows:—

Revenues of the Established Church of Ireland.

Archbishops and bishops, average income of each	£10,000..	£220,000
Estates and tithes of the deans and chapters	250,000
Ecclesiastical rectors, vicars, and perpetual curates:—		
Tithes	£590,450
Glebe-lands	91,137
Ministers' money	25,000
Church-fees	250,000
		<hr/>
		956,587
		<hr/>
Total	£1,426,587
		<hr/>

Here is, certainly, a noble revenue for the maintenance of a little insignificant church, with barely more than half a million of hearers. The established church of Scotland, with a *million and a half* of followers, is now considered amply endowed, although its revenues do not exceed £234,900, or one-sixth of those of Ireland. The sums

expended on the established priesthood of Ireland are nearly equal to one-half the amount of the revenue paid into the Exchequer, on account of public taxes for the maintenance of an army of 50,000 men, for defraying the expense of police and justice, for the support of the local administration, for defraying the interest of the public debt of Ireland, and its proportional contribution to the exigencies of the general government. It ought never to be forgotten that the immense income lavished on a luxurious priesthood, whose duties prescribe to them charity, humility, and self-denial, is wrung from a poor distressed population, of whom hundreds perish annually from sheer want of the necessaries of life, and the vast majority of whom—so little have they been benefited by the instructions of their well-paid spiritual guides—are in such a state of ignorance and destitution that they are little better fed, clothed, and lodged than the beasts of the field!

Our next inquiry is the *Number of the Clergy*, among whom the revenues of the Irish Church are squandered. The policy of the church, like that of the City companies and all corporations, has been to keep their numbers as *few*, and render their revenues as productive as possible. Formerly there were thirty-two dioceses in Ireland; these, either by parliamentary authority or by annexing sees to others by way of commendam, have been compressed into eighteen suffragan bishoprics. Thus, the work of uniting sees has been nearly as rife as that of uniting parishes. The deans and capitulary bodies are kept up as in England, though their functions are little more than nominal, and the sinecure offices and dignities appendant to them serving only to augment the otherwise redundant incomes of the priesthood. The deans and chapters are endowed in some instances with tithes, in others with lands, and in most cases with both; but their possessions are, for the most part, divided, the dean having one part alone in right of his deanery, and each member of the chapter a certain part in right of his office. Of the thirty chapters, eighteen consist of the four offices of precentor, chancellor, and archdeacon, and of prebendaries, varying, intermediately, from one, as in the case of Dromore, to twenty, as in the case of St. Patrick's, Dublin. The chapters of Waterford and Kildare are without any prebends, and in the chapter of Kildare, the eight prebendaries, although they have a voice in the election of a dean, yet form no constituent part of the chapter, which is composed of other officials and four canons.

The precentor, or cantor, is generally the first member of the chapter; his duties, in the old religious houses in papal times, were important and various, consisting in the care of the choir-service, in presiding over the singing men, organist, and choristers, paying their salaries, and keeping the seal of the chapter and chapter-book. In these cathedrals, where a choir-service is still maintained, of which there are only a few in Ireland, the precentor has the superintendence of the choir, but in all others it is a mere title of honour, without any duty whatever attached to the office. The same may be observed of the chancellors of cathedral churches, the treasurers, provosts, and prebendaries, many of whom

are without cure or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and have nothing whatever to do for their emoluments and patronage, unless it be in taking their turn of preaching in the cathedral, and that is mostly performed by deputy.

A dignity without cure is not incompatible with a parochial benefice, and both may be holden together without any dispensation for plurality; for though the dignitaries gain possession of office by institution, they are not instituted to the *cure of souls*. The cure attaches not to any office of the chapter as such; yet it is to be observed that there are no fewer than *two hundred and nineteen dignities and offices*,* to which either, by charter or other means, *one or more* parishes with cure have been annexed, and of which parishes the tithes and emoluments are received by the collegiate sinecurists, and the duties, where any exist, are mostly discharged by a stipendiary curate. The fortunate possessors of these plural offices and parishes being eligible to other benefices, one individual may concentrate in his own person scores of dignities, offices, and livings, and enjoy an aggregation of ecclesiastical income and patronage almost incredible.

Next let us advert to the number of the parochial clergy, consisting of all ecclesiastical rectors having cure, vicars, and perpetual curates, and of whom there are, according to Mr. Erck, exclusive of ninety-eight dignitaries having cure, *one thousand and seventy-five*. The assistant curates, amounting to five hundred and fifty, do not, of course, form a part of the beneficed clergy; they are only deputies, removable at pleasure, and discharging the duties, at very miserable stipends, which ought to be discharged by their principals, who receive ample remuneration. Of lay-rectors, or laymen, possessing tithes as a lay-fee, there are seven hundred and eighteen. These, not being in orders, form no part of the ecclesiastical corps; they are usually denominated *impropriators*, as being, according to Spelman, improperly possessed of the tithes of the church; inasmuch as it severs *labour from reward*,—a principle which ecclesiastics profess to repudiate, though it is notorious, the most amply endowed incumbents of the United Church of England and Ireland are as justly obnoxious to the opprobrium of being *impropriators* as the secular parsons—having, by the intervention of curates and other devices, unknown before the Reformation, contrived to rid themselves entirely of every particle of spiritual duty.

The whole number of beneficed parochial clergy, without including collegiate officials, is then only 1075, according to the admission of the editor of the Board of First Fruits. This diminutive phalanx one would think quite small enough, in all conscience, to monopolize the cure of the 2450 parishes of Ireland. But the fact is, the number of individuals is not so numerous by a great many. We have seen that 1701 parishes have been compressed into 517 benefices. Some parishes are both rectorial and vicarial; that is, the same parish has a rector and vicar, united in the same person, and which, we suspect, reckon

* Ecclesiastical Register of Ireland, p. 24.

two in Mr. Erck's enumeration of 1075. Then how many are PLURALISTS? The *Ecclesiastical Register* informs us, page 32, *one hundred and thirty-five* benefices are held with other benefices by faculty, dispensation, or permission of their diocesans. This reduces the number of individuals to 940. There appear to be 587 parishes where the vicarial are united with the rectorial tithes, or where both descriptions of tithe are united in the incumbent. It is probable, we think, the entire number of rectories, vicarages, and perpetual curacies are possessed by not more than 700 individuals, who also enjoy the chief offices in cathedrals, the diocesan schools, and public institutions of a religious and literary character.

From the *Ecclesiastical Register*, and other sources, we collect that the number of preferments in Ireland—episcopal, collegiate, and parochial—possessed by the established clergy, are as follow:—

Sees	22
Deaneries	33
Precentorships	26
Chancellorships	22
Treasurerships	22
Archdeaconries	34
Provostships ..	2
Prebends and canonries.....	188
Rural deans	107
Vicars choral.....	52
Choristers	20
Choir readers and stipendiaries	12
Diocesan schools	30
Offices in consistorial courts	175
Benefices consisting of a single parish	749
Parishes compressed into 517 benefices.....	1701
Total of offices enjoyed by the established clergy...	<u>3195</u>

Thus it appears there are 3195 offices shared among about *eight hundred and fifty* individuals, whose aggregate ecclesiastical revenue amounts to £1,426,587, averaging £1678 to each person. Such proportions between numbers, offices, and revenue are certainly without parallel. There is no example any where of 850 persons possessing, in see-lands and glebes, one-tenth of the soil, and claiming one-tenth of the produce of the remainder, which supports eight millions of people. No country, however debased by superstition, ever abandoned one-tenth of its real property, in addition to a tenth part of the national income, for the maintenance of a priesthood, forming less than a nine-thousandth part of the population.

It is not, however, the average income of either the Irish or English ecclesiastic that constitutes the principal abuse in their respective establishments. Although both churches might very well spare *two-thirds* of their aggregate revenues, and enough remain for the adequate remuneration of spiritual service, still it is not the redundancy of their united incomes that is so objectionable as the unequal and inhuman

manner in which they are possessed by candidates of the same grade and pretension. We have before enlarged on this point in our exposition of the Church of England; we have there shown how masses of pay and pluralities of office are heaped on clerical sinecurists enjoying high connexions and influence; while the most useful and meritorious labourers in the ministry, divested of patronage, are kept in the most miserable poverty and dependence. Precisely the same injustice predominates in the Irish church. In the latter the grievance is more intolerable, for, in Ireland, *church-patronage* is chiefly in the hands of ecclesiastics, and it is invariably observed that the clergy have less regard for their brethren, and more blindly intent on promoting their own personal and family interests than laymen.

We shall insert a tabular representation of the patronage of the Irish church; the number of parishes in Ireland is greater than appears from the subjoined statement, as is evident from the *Ecclesiastical Register*. But it is a point on which there is much difference of opinion, originating in the uncertain boundaries of parishes, and the extraordinary manner they have been consolidated, to serve the purposes of clerical rapacity.

Irish Church Patronage.

DIOCESES.	Patronage of Bishops.	Patronage of Crown.	Others.		Improprate without Churches or Incumbents.
			Lay.	Uni- versit	
Armagh	60	13	22	5	
Cashell and Emly					
Clogher	34	1	2	4	
Clonfert and Kilmacduagh.....	43	3	14		
Cloyne	107	10	9		11
Cork and Ross	94	8			
Derry	33	3	9	3	
Down and Connor	53	12	36		10
Dromore	23		2		
Dublin	144	15	16		
Elphin	72	2	1		
Kildare	30	27	24		
Killala and Achonry	48	4			
Killaloe and Kilfenora	131	10	36		17
Kilmore	33	3	2	1	
Leighlin and Ferns	171	18	19	1	13
Limerick, Ardfer, and Aghadoe....	34	27	65		
Meath	69	81	37		35
Ossory	76	26	30		
Raphoe	15	6	3	7	
Tuam and Ardagh	79		10		
Waterford and Lismore	43	24	30		9
	1392	293	367	21	95
Patronage of Bishops.....					1392
Ditto Crown					293
Ditto Lay					367
Ditto University					21
					2168

The Irish bishops have a far greater proportion of patronage than the English bishops: the former have the gift of 1392 livings out of 2168; the latter have only the gift of 1290 out of 11,598. The livings, too, in the gift of the Irish bishops are far more valuable. Those in the gift of the Archbishop of Cashel are worth £35,000 per annum; those in the gift of the Bishop of Cloyne, £50,000; of Cork, £30,000; and of Ferns, £30,000. In the see of Cloyne ONE living is worth £3000, one worth £2000, and three worth £1500 each. A living of £500, as we have seen, is but a middling one in Ireland, and any thing beneath it is considered very low.

The king's ministers, nominating the bishops, and these having the disposal of all the livings, with the exception of a few to the Universities, lay lords, and those that are tithe free, the whole of the tithes and church revenues of Ireland are in the gift of the crown. Hence we may see how hopeless is the prospect of ecclesiastical *reform* under the present system. The Irish sees are almost in the exclusive possession of the thick-and-thin supporters of administration, in the families of the Beresfords, the Clancartys, Balcarras, Mayos, Northlands, Rodens, Hoaths, Kilkennys, Caledons, &c. Among whom one looks in vain for a single scholar or celebrated divine. Indeed the Irish Protestant Establishment forms a convenient and almost inexhaustible fund for parliamentary corruption; and appointments to it, like those in the Colonies, being out of sight of the English public, they are often made without any regard to decency. Thus a lieutenant in the navy has been made an archbishop; a member of the House of Commons, a dean; a proprietor, and it is said editor, of a newspaper, a chancellor; and an aide-de-camp at the Castle, a rich rector. Such men as Sir Harcourt Lees, and the hero of Skibbereen, and the late Jocelyn, having attained preferments in the church, are still more illustrative. Lord MOUNT-CASHEL stated, in the House of Lords, last session, that he knew an archdeacon in Ireland who kept one of the best *packs of fox-hounds* in the country. Another clergyman, not seven miles distant from the former, had, also, a pack of fox-hounds, with which he regularly hunted; and he knew of a clergyman who, after his duties in the church had been performed, used to meet his brother-huntsmen at the *communion-table, on the Sunday*, and arrange with them where the hounds were to start for next day. Can these things be, when it is alleged, by Sir Robert Peel, that the church has no support to depend upon but her "*own purity*?"

Non-residence of the Irish Clergy.

It is a curious fact that, during the sway of the Catholic Church, no man was permitted to hold a benefice who did not perform the duties of it upon the spot, and it was left for the Reformation, which is said to have established religion in greater perfection, to entitle a man to a large income for the cure of souls in a district which he never visited. A large pro-

portion of the Irish Bishops, Dignitaries, and Incumbents, are *absentees*; many of them whiling away their time on the Continent, and others dissipating their large revenues in the fashionable circles of Brighton and London. With the single exception of the Bishop of Kildare all the archbishops and bishops have each, within their respective dioceses, an episcopal residence, or see-house, with parks, chases, and demesne-lands attached. Yet they spend little or none of their time in Ireland in superintending the clergy. The families of some prelates reside constantly in England, and the only duty performed by the bishop is to cross the water in the summer months, take a peep at the "*palace*," and then return to give grand dinners, and mingle in the gaieties of the metropolis, for the remainder of the year. The late Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, resided twenty years abroad, and during that time received the revenue of his rich diocese, amounting to £240,000. This Right Rev. Prelate was the intimate associate of Lady Hamilton, the kept-mistress of Lord Nelson. The bishop lived in Italy, spending his princely income, wrung from the soil and labour of Ireland, among the fiddlers and prostitutes of that debauched country. The great primate Rokeby resided at Bath, and never visited Ireland. The parochial clergy are not more exemplary. Upwards of *one-third* of the whole number of incumbents do not reside on their benefices. Some of them, with incomes of £5,000 or £10,000 a-year, are living in France, with their wives and families. Others live at Bath, on *account of the gout*. Most of them never see their parishes, deriving their incomes through the medium of agents, or of tithe-farmers, and engaging a curate at some £30 or £50 a-year to attend *once* on each Sunday to read prayers; often, perhaps, only to the parish clerk.

According to the *Diocesan Returns*, in 1819, the following was the state of the provinces, as regards parochial residence and duty:—

The province of Ulster, containing 443 parishes or unions, had 351 incumbents resident, or *near enough to do duty*.

The province of Leinster, 281 parishes or unions, with 189 incumbents resident, or *near enough to do duty*.

The province of Munster, 419 parishes or unions, with 281 incumbents resident, or *near enough to do duty*.

The province of Connaught, 95 parishes or unions, with 65 incumbents resident, or *near enough to do duty*.

Thus, in 354 parishes or unions, there was neither an incumbent resident, nor near enough to do the duty of his benefice. These returns make the number of incumbents, resident and non-resident, amount to 1240. It is unnecessary to explain, after what has been already stated, that there are not actually so many individuals. The deception results from pluralities. Every benefice with cure has an incumbent; but, as each incumbent often holds two or more benefices, or is rector and vicar of the same parish, it reduces the number of individuals to the amount stated, (page 98,) namely *seven hundred*.

One great excuse for the neglect of duty by the protestant clergy is that they have scarcely any duty to perform. Notwithstanding all the

inducements offered by the established religion, notwithstanding its monopoly of tithes, honours, power, and emoluments, it has scarcely any followers. A protestant is as rare to be met with in Ireland, as a Jew in England. Out of a population of eight millions, there are little more than half a million communicants of the state religion. The consequence is, that the church establishment is little better than an enormous sinecure, a *prodigious job*, carried on for the benefit of a few hundred individuals, to the impoverishment, disunion, and degradation of all the rest of the nation. The Irish Church has been aptly compared to some Irish regiment, in which there was the whole train of officers, from the colonel downwards, but only *ONE private*. Just so with the ecclesiastical establishment; there is the whole apparatus of bishops, deans, archdeacons, prebendaries, canons, rectors, and vicars; there are all these still, and, what is better, there are all the tithes, houses, gardens, glebe lands, cathedrals, and palaces: all these remain; but the *PEOPLE*—those for whose benefit they were originally intended, they have adhered unflinchingly to their old communion. Why then should not the revenues and church lands follow them—the *OWNERS*, for whose benefit they were first appropriated? Why keep up twenty-two bishops where there are scarcely any parsons? or why maintain these parsons, with large endowments, when they have lost their flocks? There are scores, aye, hundreds of well paid rectors and vicars, without a single protestant hearer; there are *thirteen hundred and fifty parishes*, without even a church to preach in; yet in all these parishes the tithes are levied or compounded for to the utmost farthing. That such an ecclesiastical system should be defended almost exceeds belief; we shall shortly see, however, that it has not only been defended, but its monstrous abuses fostered and encouraged by legislative acts.

Oppressiveness of the Tithe System.

Hardship and impoverishment result not less from the amount than the *mode* in which the ecclesiastical revenues are levied in Ireland. By the *Tithe Composition Act*, an attempt has been made, without at all lessening the amount of the burthen, to avert the occurrence of these disgraceful scenes, which so frequently accompanied the collection of the tithe-tax. Under the authority of this statute, it has been seen, many parishes have compounded with the incumbent for tithes; but as these compositions can only be entered into for a *limited term*, and as the rate of them varies with the fluctuations in the value and quantity of produce, the whole kingdom may be still considered to labour under the curse of an impost, whose pressure increases with every increase of capital and industry. One circumstance deserving notice in the history of this exaction, is, the abolition of *tithes of agistment*, which leaves tillage lands alone liable to the burthen. This selfish and partial enactment of the Irish parliament shows clearly enough how necessary it is that the different classes of society should be represented in the legis-

lature; otherwise they are sure to be sacrificed, without regard to justice or humanity, to the exclusive advantage of the ruling power. The abolition of tithe of pasture causes the revenues of the clergy to be principally drawn from tithe of corn, and of the cattle, pigs, poultry, and potatoes of the cotter tenantry. While tithes of agistment were paid, the burden, in part, fell upon the opulent grazier,—the landed aristocracy of Ireland; but now the burden presses with disproportionate weight on the poorer cultivators of the soil. Owing to the increase in the numbers, skill, and industry of this class, the quantity of agricultural produce has been augmented a hundred fold, and in the same proportion has augmented the revenue of the church. While the Irish cultivator has been adding to his income by industry, and by the abridgment of the comforts and enjoyments of his family, he has been constrained, also, to add proportionately to the income of the Protestant priest, whose religion he does not profess, and whose intolerant dogmas long withheld from him his civil immunities.

In England, where, in many parts, a man cannot cut a cabbage, pull a carrot, or gather a bunch of grapes, without giving notice to the parson, the system is sufficiently intolerable;* but in Ireland, from the mode of collecting tithes, those evils are aggravated tenfold. The Irish clergy generally employ an agent, called a *proctor*, who, immediately before harvest, estimates the barrels of corn, tons of hay, or hundred weight of potatoes, he supposes are on the ground, and, charging the market price, ascertains the amount to be paid by the owner. This notable agent generally holds his session on Sunday, at a pot-house, where he meets the farmers. As the terms are seldom agreed upon at the first meeting, others follow, and the *reckonings*, on these occasions, are always paid by the farmers, which add not a little to their charges. The parson sometimes leases the tithes out to the proctor, at a fixed rent, like a farm; while the latter, who, in that case, is called the middle proctor, not unfrequently relets them to another. In the south, the tithe is set out and sold by *public auction on the premises*. And, in Connaught, it is customary to call a sale before the harvest, at which the tithe is sold to any person who chooses to collect it.

Under such a system, it is easy to conceive what the Irish must endure. Nothing escapes the vigilance of the spiritual locust, or his agent. No bog, however deep—no mountain, however high—nor heath, nor rock, whatever industry may have reclaimed, or capital fertilized—all is liable to the full penalty of having been made available to the uses

* Lord Mountcashel, in his speech, last session, on Church Reform, relates a curious anecdote, illustrative of the luscious keenness of the English clergy after tithes. His lordship had been recently in company with a clergyman, while looking after his *tenth*s; and when the man in orders met a goose with its goslings, he stopped to count the progeny, and would cry, "*Ah! there's one for me.*" Or, if he overtook a sow with her litter, he summed them up, with the observation, "*Ah! there are two for me.*" The noble lords were highly diverted with this example of ecclesiastical cupidity: they laughed heartily, and our readers may laugh too—if they like.

of man. From the proctors and middle proctors, neither lenity nor indulgence can be expected. These men, to whom the odious office of reaping the fruits of the industry of others has been delegated, are, probably, strangers in the parish, without motive for cultivating the friendship of the people, and having farmed the tithe for a stipulated sum, it is to be expected they will collect it with the utmost rigour, in order to realize the greatest profit from their bargain. The most distressing scenes are sometimes witnessed from their relentless proceedings, and the tithes not unfrequently collected with the aid of a constabulary or military force. The half-famished cottier, surrounded by a wretched family, clamorous for food, frequently beholds the tenth part of the produce of his potatoe garden, carried off to fill the insatiable maw of clerical rapacity. "I have seen," says Mr. Wakefield, "the cow, the favourite cow, driven away, accompanied by the sighs, the tears, and the imprecations of a whole family, who were paddling after, through wet and dirt, to take their last affectionate farewell of this their only benefactor at the pound gate. I have heard, with emotions which I can scarcely describe, deep cursèd repeated from village to village, as the cavalcade proceeded. I have witnessed the group pass the domain walls of the opulent grazier, whose numerous herds were cropping the most luxuriant pastures, whilst he was secure from any demand for the tithe of their food, looking on with the utmost indifference."—*Statistics of Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 466.

To spare the rich and plunder the poor, is certainly not christianity; it is more like Church of Englandism, which, by the union of church and state, has perverted the pure and charitable faith of Christ into a tremendous engine of political guilt and spiritual extortion. There is, we are assured, plenty of law in Ireland, as well as in this country, to punish injustice: there is no *wrong*, we are told, *without a remedy*; the courts of justice are open, as the hypocrites say in England, for the punishment of either magisterial or clerical delinquents. All this sounds well on paper, or in the bloated harangues of an attorney-general; but it is mere mockery and insult when offered to the victims of oppression. Law, in both countries, is for those who can pay for it—the rich, not the poor. The poor cottier, oppressed or defrauded by the exaction of the tithe-proctor, to the value of £10, cannot buy a chance of redress in the lottery of the law for less than £60. By victory or defeat he is equally and irremediably ruined. What resource, then, have men whose possessions probably do not amount to half that sum? None. The way to courts of justice, through the impassable barrier of attorneys and lawyers' fees, is *over a bridge of gold*; and to point out these tribunals for redress, either to English or Irish poor, or even to those moderately endowed with wealth, is, in other words, to point out to a man the shortest way by which he may bring himself to the jail and his family to the workhouse.

Proportion of Catholics and Protestants.

It has latterly become as essential a part of the system to conceal the number of followers of the Irish Protestant church, as the amount of its revenues. When the last census was taken, it had been easy to ascertain the respective proportions of Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and other Dissenters; but government, for obvious reasons, declined making any such classification. The witnesses examined by parliamentary committees in 1825, evinced much diversity of opinion. Mr. O'Connell thought the Protestants of all sects did not exceed a million.* Mr. Leslie Foster supposed them to amount to 1,270,000. Mr. Mason, who had spent much time in inquiries of this nature, calculated the proportion of Catholics to Protestants as $3\frac{1}{6}$ to 1, which estimate he founded on returns from 300 parishes, or about one-eighth of the whole number.† Another account, which professes to be founded on the best information, gives the following estimate:—The census made the population amount to 6,800,000; if divided into fourteenths, it was estimated one-fourteenth belonged to the established church, or 490,000 souls; Presbyterians, and other Dissenters, formed another fourteenth; so that there remained 5,820,000 Catholics. The population has since increased to at least eight millions; and, supposing the proportion continues the same, there are now 571,428 Episcopalians, an equal number of Dissenting Protestants, and 6,857,143 Catholics.

How the followers of the united church have come to bear so small a proportion, and of the church of Rome so large a one, can only be accounted for by the observation of a celebrated writer, that you may persecute a doctrine up to any number of adherents; and the converse—pamper it down to any number. The selfish and intolerant spirit which so long swayed the destinies of Ireland, by drawing a broad line of distinction betwixt the dominant and proscribed faith, rendered defection from the latter next to impossible. A sense of common injustice cemented more strongly the bonds of union among the Catholics, and gave to their civil disabilities the semblance of a martyrdom, which no one, by apostacy, could escape, without suspicion of being influenced by sordid considerations. Hence, a close and indignant sentiment was fostered, sufficient not only to withstand the claims of the reformed worship, but the influence of property, and the coercive power of authority. Fidelity to the religion of their fathers was identified with fidelity to their countrymen; and no one could secede, without being exposed to the double opprobrium of national treachery and selfish hypocrisy. It follows, that the sectarian missionaries, spread through Ireland, have had little success among the Catholics, and the proselytes they have made have been chiefly picked up in the less guarded folds of the established pastors.

* Parliamentary Papers, vol. ix. p. 83, Session 1825.

† Ibid. p. 308.

The Catholic religion, however, has not only kept its relative position, but has actually gained ground; for, during the last half century, the proportion of Protestants has declined. In 1766, the Protestants formed nearly *one-half* the population; in 1822, they formed only *one-seventh*; while the Catholics had more than quadrupled from 1766 to 1822, the Protestants had scarcely doubled. This striking fact will be more evident from the following statement, drawn up partly from parliamentary returns, and partly from the estimate of Dr. Beaufort, and other well-informed individuals.

	Year 1766.	Year 1792.	Year 1822.
Protestants.....	544,865	522,023	980,000
Catholics	1,326,960	3,261,303	5,820,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	1,871,725	3,783,326	6,800,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

The increase of Protestants, from 1792 to 1822, is chiefly ascribed to the exertions of the *Methodists*. It affords a striking illustration of the efficacy of tithes, and large ecclesiastical endowments, in promoting religion; for it is clear, from the above, that the state worship has declined, in spite of its enormous emoluments. Those who are zealous for the promotion of religion, ought not to defend either the Irish or English establishment; for, under both branches of the united church, the number of their members has relatively decreased. Pure christianity, indeed, can never flourish under the auspices of wealth and power; its precepts and origin are in perfect contrast to the titles, pomps, and vanities of the world. It has no connexion with bishops, nor courts, nor palaces; it was cradled in indigence; it flourished from persecution, it denounced the cant of hypocrites, and never allied itself with the Scribes and Pharisees of authority. They may, indeed, baptize state religions under the name of Christianity, but it has little to do with them; they are only heathen institutions, and their followers more the disciples of Mahomet than of Jesus Christ.

Little more than one-fourteenth of the population of Ireland belongs to the state religion, yet the teachers of this fraction of the community claim *one-tenth* of the produce that feeds the whole EIGHT MILLIONS! Surely if church property was intended for the maintenance of religion, it was intended for the religion of the PEOPLE, not for an insignificant minority of them.

But the misappropriation of ecclesiastical wealth is far from being the extent of the injustice sustained by the Irish and their *real* pastors. The important statute of the Session of 1829 was, no doubt, a great boon to the aristocracy and gentry, by qualifying them for seats in parliament and civil offices; still, as various penal statutes in force against the priesthood were left unrepealed by the *Catholic Relief Act*, they continue to sustain great hardship and opprobrium. Some of the penal acts remaining in force are very unjust and even cruel in their provisions: for instance, if a Catholic priest from inadvertency or misinfor-

mation marry two Protestants, or, a Protestant and Catholic, he is liable to a penalty of £500, or, according to a decision of an Orange Chief Justice, he is liable to suffer DEATH. The clergy are not allowed to officiate in any place with steeple or bells; they are prohibited from appearing abroad in the costume of their order; they cannot be guardians, nor receive the personal endowment of any Catholic chapel, school-house, or other pious or charitable foundation. If they do not disclose the secrets of auricular confession, which their religious tenets prohibit them to disclose, they are liable to imprisonment; if a Jesuit enter the kingdom he may be banished for life, and any persons entering such religious order is guilty of a misdemeanor.* No Catholic in Ireland is allowed for his defence to have arms in his house, unless he have a freehold of £10 a-year or £300 personal property. And, though he is liable to parish cess, he is disabled from voting at vestries, on questions relating to repairs of churches. Lastly, no Catholic of the United Kingdom is eligible to the offices of Lord Chancellor, Keeper or Commissioner of the Great Seal, Lord-lieutenant, Deputy or Governor of Ireland, or High Commissioner in Scotland; nor to any office in the ecclesiastical courts; in the universities, the colleges of Eton, Westminster, and Winchester.

The Catholic clergy are in number between 2000 and 3000, constantly residing among their flocks and ministering to their spiritual comforts. From the absence of any permanent provision for maintenance, and the general poverty of their followers, they live in indigence and hardship. Their chief dependence is on fees for burials, marriages, and christenings, gifts on confessions, and bequests for the celebration of masses for the *repose of the dead*. Hence they have seldom the means of comfortable subsistence, are often without a decent place for religious worship, are overpowered by calls for religious exertion, live in misery, and die at last without ever tasting those emoluments which formerly belonged to their church, and are now showered on the Jocelyns, Laurences, Plunkets, Beresfords, Magees, and Trenches of the Establishment.

Management of the First Fruits Fund.

With so large a portion of the national wealth placed at the disposal of the clergy, the very least we might have expected the Legislature to do was to enforce the payment of all the taxes to which by law the Church was liable. We have already seen by what artifice the English ecclesiastics avoided contributing their full share to the *First Fruits Fund*; we shall now show that a similar but more flagrant evasion of their pecuniary obligations has been long tolerated on the part of the Irish clergy. Having already explained the nature of the annats (page 61) it will be only necessary here to remark that a similar usage

* Catholic Relief Act, 10 Geo. IV. c. 7, ss. 29—36.

formerly prevailed in both England and Ireland; with this difference, that the Irish clergy paid in lieu of a tenth, only a twentieth of the annual value of each benefice to the Pope. In the reign of Henry VIII. when the papal rights were extinguished, an act passed for annexing to the crown the revenue arising from first fruits and tenths, and the same provision was made, as in England, for ascertaining, from time to time, their real annual value. This arrangement continued till the year 1710; when Queen Ann, acting under the advice of her Tory ministers, remitted the twentieths to the clergy, rich and poor, without distinction, and gave the first fruits, alone, to form a fund for *building churches, purchasing glebes and glebe-houses*, augmenting poor livings, and other ecclesiastical improvements. The management of the fund was vested in trustees, consisting of the higher dignitaries of the church, and principal law-officers of the crown, who were empowered to "*search out the just and true value*" of the benefices of which they were to levy the first year's income from each incumbent who came into possession. The valuation under which the first fruits were levied when they were given to the trustees, was the same as in the time of Henry VIII. and was not only very low, but did not include more than *two-thirds* of the benefices of Ireland. It was of course the duty of the Board of First Fruits to promote the objects of the fund, to have remedied the inaccuracies, and supplied the omissions in the original valuation; but this has never been done, and up to this day the first fruits are levied according to the defective valuation at the time of the Reformation. Owing to this mode of procedure, instead of the produce of the first fruits being the real worth of every vacant benefice and dignity, it is a mere nominal sum paid by the clergy. The bishop of Derry, with a revenue of £12,000, paid only £250 first fruits; the see of Clogher, worth £7000, pays only £350; and the see of Cloyne, worth £6000, pays only £10:10s. It is calculated that, at a fair valuation of Irish benefices, omitting those under £150 a-year, the first fruits would produce £40,000 a-year: whereas, in the ten years ending January, 1830, they produced only £5,142:15s; from which £740 was to be deducted for salaries.* During this period of ten years, fifteen bishoprics and four archbishoprics had become vacant, and the successors thereto liable to the payment of first fruits.

Can it be believed that the Imperial Parliament would sanction such an evasion of their duty by the rich clergy of Ireland? Such, however, has been the fact. Sir JOHN NEWPORT, every session for the last twelve years, has been making motions to establish the integrity of the First Fruits Fund; but his laudable endeavours have seldom met with support of more than *thirty* or *forty* honourable members. But this is not the worst trait in the proceedings of the Collective Wisdom of the Nation: they have actually voted large sums out of the pockets of the people for the very objects for which this fund was appropriated. In

* Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons, May 18th, 1830.

the twenty years ending in 1822, the grants of parliament to the trustees of First Fruits in Ireland, towards building new churches, glebe-houses, and purchasing of glebes, amounted to £686,000. Thus has £34,300 a-year been levied on this tax-paying aristocratic gulled nation, merely to save the richest church in the world from contributing to its own necessities. How much more has been levied by parochial taxation on the unfortunate population of Ireland, for the repair of churches and cathedrals, we have not the means of estimating. It is well known the sums raised for this purpose constitute one of the many grievances of the sister kingdom, the hardship of which is aggravated by the Catholics being excluded from voting in parish vestries when the church-cess is imposed. Had the Commissioners of First Fruits done what the law not only authorized, but required them to do, there would have been no need of church-rates, nor grants from parliament. Why the Commissioners have not done their duty and made a fair valuation of benefices is manifest enough; they are the patrons, holders, or expectants of large preferments, and a just valuation would be a tax upon THEMSELVES! Ought, however, "the Guardians of the Public Purse" to have sanctioned this selfish breach of trust? Ought they, whose business is to watch over the interests of the people, yearly to have voted away the public money, for objects for which there was already a legal and adequate provision? No innovation, nothing untried was to be attempted; the only measure requisite was that they should enforce the *law of the land*, for which, on other occasions, they profess such profound veneration. It is to the deficiencies of First Fruits, and the consequent non-residence of the clergy, for want of parsonage-houses and glebes, that the decay of Protestantism has been ascribed by their servile defenders: hence a regard to the interests of our "holy religion" one would have thought a sufficient motive for our virtuous representatives to interfere.

The most curious incident regarding the annats is the result of the endeavours of Mr. Shaw Mason to obtain a more authentic valuation. When the subject began to excite attention, this gentleman, the words of whose patent empowered him "to collect, levy, receive, and examine the just and true value of first fruits," preferred a memorial to the Board, setting forth his authority and expressing his willingness to exercise it as his duty required. The announcement caused not a little alarm, the four archbishops at the time not having paid in their arrears. A report was made to the local government who, after referring the matter to the attorney and solicitor generals for their opinion, intimated to Mr. Mason if he persevered in his design of enforcing the payment of first fruits at their real value, they would *deprive him of his patent office*, which he held at the pleasure of the Crown.* So the matter ended; the rich clergy enjoy, undiminished, their princely revenues, and the public remains liable to the burthen of contributing towards the

* Mr. Spring Rice, House of Commons, May 18, Session 1830.

purchase of glebes and houses for Irish parsons, many of whom have already half a dozen houses, residing in none of them, and 4000 acres of glebe.

Intolerance towards Dissenters and Roman Catholics.

Before concluding our account of the United Church of England and Ireland, we cannot help shortly adverting to the slow steps by which religious toleration has been established in this country. Looking back to the history of the Dissenters, we see with what difficulty freedom of thought has been wrung from the prosecuting grasp of what is considered a reformed Establishment. It was not till the Revolution of 1688 that the public worship of the Dissenters was tolerated; and the Act of Toleration at that period required them to take certain oaths and subscribe to the doctrinal articles of the Church of England. The same act, so much extolled, requires the places of worship to be registered, and the doors kept unlocked during the time of service. Even liberty of worship, under these suspicious and odious restrictions, it was subsequently attempted to abridge. In the latter part of Queen Ann's reign, an act passed, called the *Occasional Conformity Bill*, making it a crime in any person, in any office under government, entering a meeting-house. Another bill, denominated the *Schism Bill*, passed in 1714, suffered no Dissenter to educate his own children, but required them to be put into the hands of a Church of Englandist, and forbad all tutors and schoolmasters being present at any dissenting place of worship.

The last attempt upon this body was the memorable bill of Lord Sidmouth in 1810. This meditated encroachment upon their liberties was worthy of the sinister statesman from whom it emanated. The Dissenters, to their immortal honour, rushed forward at once to repel this aggression on their rights. Had they suffered their ministers to be placed at the mercy of the *Quarter Sessions*, the magistrates, no doubt, would not only have judged of their fitness for the ministry of the Gospel, but also of their fitness for the ministry of the Boroughmongers.

This disgraceful spirit of legislation is now only matter for history. The repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts and the Catholic Relief Act have scarcely left any trace of the formidable penal code which, for a long time, interdicted to a large portion of the community not only the enjoyment of their civil immunities, but the free disposal of their persons and property. The Dissenters may still complain of being excluded from the national universities; they may also think it a hardship in case they fill any judicial, civil, or corporate office, that they cannot appear in their *official costume*, nor with the *insignia of their office* at their own places of worship; but these are trifling grievances, scarcely worth mentioning. They are subject to no test on account of religious belief; and it may be now truly said that, with the exception of Jews and openly professing INFIDELS, the honours and advantages of

the social state—so far, at least, as spiritual dogmas are concerned—are fairly opened to every candidate.

For this salutary triumph we have been indebted solely to *secular* wisdom, not to any generous concessions or enlightenment proceeding from our established instructors. The Church has always shown itself more tenacious of its monopoly than even the Aristocracy. Of the lofty tone of intolerance maintained by some of our high dignitaries, to a recent period, we have a rather amusing instance, in the conduct of DR. KIPLING, the late Dean of Peterborough, and which we shall shortly relate. The Rev. Mr. Lingard, the distinguished Roman Catholic historian, had, it seems, in his *Strictures on Professor Marsh's "Comparative View,"* &c. used the words "*new Church of England*" once, and oftener "*the modern Church of England.*" To consider the Church of England "*new,*" or "*modern*" appeared a mortal offence in the eyes of *Dean Kipling*. He wrote a furious letter to Mr. Lingard; quoted a passage from Hawkins; and threatened to prosecute him if he did not, within a limited time, prove what the Dean intimated it was impossible for him to prove. Whether the Dean afterwards relented, or whether Mr. Lingard proved that the Church of England, as being the offspring or daughter of the Church of Rome, which, in many respects, she so much resembles, was "*new,*" we are ignorant. Did our limits permit, we would insert the Very Rev. Dean's loving epistle. It would show what a meek, gentle, Christian spirit may still rankle in the hearts of some of our church dignitaries. It would show to what expedients these worthies would resort to uphold their faith, or, more correctly, their temporalities, were they not restrained by the march of philosophy and the public mind. It is impossible to read *Dean Kipling's* letter without feeling persuaded that, had Mr. Lingard had no better barrier for his personal safety than the tolerant spirit of the writer, he might still be liable to be hung up by the middle, with an iron chain, and roasted before a slow fire, according to the orthodox piety of olden time.

Men ought always to set their faces against prosecution for *opinions*, whether instituted under pretence of heresy, sectarianism, Judaism, or even infidelity. Under any of these forms it is the same mischievous and dogmatical principle. What difference, for instance, is there in the principles of a prosecution instituted at this day for Judaism or infidelity, and a Popish prosecution instituted in the reign of Queen Mary on account of the *real presence*. In both cases difference of opinion is combated by corporeal infliction; the Papist punished by fire, the modern intolerant by fine, imprisonment, or civil disability. The difference in the punishment makes no difference in the motive; in both cases it is combating *mind* by physical force, and he who employs such a weapon is as deeply immersed in the night of Popery, as Bishop Bonner, who laboured to convert the miserable victims of his cruelty by a vigorous application of birch to the posteriors.

The ingenuous mind revolts from the idea of maintaining opinions by *force*, to say that any class of opinions shall not be impugned, that their truth shall not be called in question, is at once to declare that these

opinions are infallible, and that their authors cannot err. What can be more egregiously absurd and presumptuous? It is fixing bounds to human knowledge, and saying that men cannot learn by experience; that they can never be wiser in future than they are to day. The vanity and folly of this is sufficiently evinced by the history of religion and philosophy. Great changes have taken place in both; and what our ancestors considered indisputable truths their posterity discovered to be gross errors. To continue the work of improvement, no dogmas, however plausible, ought to be protected from investigation; and the only security of the present generation against the errors of their progenitors, is modestly to admit that, in some things, they may possibly yet be mistaken.

The Papists are not the only class of religionists obnoxious to the reproach of uncharitable tenets. HUME justly remarks that *toleration* is not the virtue of priests of any denomination; and this is amply confirmed by the history of the Scottish, Romish, and English churches. They have all *shed blood*, tortured, and punished, when circumstances gave them an ascendancy. The reason is obvious. Religion is more the result of *feeling* than of *understanding*; and it may be expected that its most intense professors should be more prompt to use the vulgar weapons suggested by passion and violence, than listen to the dictates of reason and humanity.

Conclusion.

We have now fairly brought forward whatever can elucidate the present state of the United Church of England and Ireland, and its claims to the support and veneration of the community. Those whose vocation is to mislead and delude may attempt to impugn our statements and calumniate our motives; but their labour will be vain, unless they can disprove our **FACTS**. We have trusted to nothing apocryphal, and rarely depended on the testimony of individual observers. Our statements have been chiefly drawn from the admissions of the parties who wallow in the corruptions of which we complain,—from official returns to parliament,—and other accredited sources of information. On the results derived from these we have occasionally submitted reflections, the justice of which we leave to the reader's consideration.

If such ecclesiastical establishments as we have exposed be much longer tolerated in their existing state, the people will evince a patience and fatuity far exceeding any previous estimate. No doubt there are mysteries in the art of governing, as well as truths in science, that have not yet been discovered. It is impossible to foresee what unheard of wiles, delusions, and influence, Corruption may bring into play to stifle the claims of truth and justice. A nation, which, from groundless fears of change, was deluded into the support of a thirty year's war against human rights and happiness, and had entailed upon it a debt of eight hundred millions, may, by some new fascination, be

brought to tolerate a church that absorbs annually ELEVEN MILLIONS of public income, ostensibly for religion, though it is religion's most dangerous foe, and not one hundredth part of which rewards the labours of those really engaged in clerical duty. A pretended anxiety for our spiritual welfare will, however, we trust, no longer serve for a cloak to temporal rapacity. The repetition of such detected knavery would be a national insult and impertinence: some new-fangled scarecrows, therefore, must be devised, other than the dangers of irreligion and democratic encroachment, to consecrate hereafter the oppression of tithes and the absurdities of rotten boroughs.

Secular abuses sink almost into insignificance when compared with those of our church-establishment. *One hundred and thirteen* privy councillors receiving £650,164 a-year out of the public taxes, seems an astounding fact; but we are sure, and those who have honoured us with attention in the preceding exposition, we are convinced, will believe us when we affirm it would be easy to select a smaller number of sinecure ecclesiastics who receive more and do less than this devouring clan of Oligarchs.

There is one truth connected with the state of church-property in Ireland which is, perhaps, not unworthy the attention of her Protestant oppressors. If the tithe and ecclesiastical estates of that country do not soon receive a more beneficial application, to a certainty they will, ere long, devolve to the *Catholic priesthood*. The ties which connect the two countries are daily becoming weaker, and a foreign war or other favourable juncture, concurring with the united power of a hostile faith—a public opinion newly created and beyond the influence of the Castle—and a numerous and discontented population, may soon effect an eternal separation. Either then by the occurrence of the event to which we allude, or, if that do not happen, by the mere reason and superiority of the claim, the vast and tempting possessions of a handful of Episcopalian teachers must assuredly pass to her more numerous rivals. A separation of the two kingdoms, in our humble opinion, would be a calamity to both. From Britain it would sever the right arm of her power; and what could Ireland gain by a separate existence? She does not possess within herself the elements to constitute a *rational* and independent state. Supposing for a moment she escaped a century of civil war, and forthwith passed under the yoke of O'CONNELL I., with a deplorably ignorant population for his lieges—a fanatical, but richly endowed priesthood, as they would be with the lands and tithes of the Protestant establishment—for the servile instruments of his sovereignty—what a spectacle would Ireland present! Under such a regime, it is easy to discern insuperable obstacles to every social improvement. For ages she would be no better under her *new* autocrat, than Portugal under DON MIGUEL, or Naples under the sway of a BOURBON. Every sincere well-wisher to the greatness and happiness of England and Ireland must deplore the idea of dismemberment: united, they are a source of mutual light and power; dissevered, they would be the luminary of day and lamp of night struck from their orbits. So fatal a catastrophe, we are confident, can only be averted by

ecclesiastical reform. Instead of burthening the yet struggling manufactures and agriculture of the Irish with *additional taxes*, a resource ought to be sought in the crown-lands of Ireland, and in the wasted estates of the Church, in the million of neglected acres possessed by absentee bishops, and in the million and more worth of land and tithes possessed by the collegiate bodies and non-resident incumbents. Here is the panacea for cementing the UNION, producing tranquillity, and supplying the wants of an impoverished Exchequer.

The besotted tyranny which has impeded the prosperity of Ireland will hardly be credited by posterity. Her population is only *half-civilized*; in religion, manners, and domestic habits, no better than the rabble of the Peninsula; while her lands in whole districts are as little cultivated as the wilds of Tartary. We do not allude to the bog and mountain wastes; and these, in great part, continue such from an obstinate legislation which tolerates, year after year, the remains of baronial tenures;—but would it be believed that there is, or was, so recently as 1821, a tract of country in the south of Ireland, occupying 800 square miles of territory, in which there is not a single resident gentleman, nor clergyman, nor a single road fit for a wheel-carriage to pass? This is the testimony of Mr. Baron FOSTER; and hear it, Boroughmongers! you, who have expended millions to fortify Canada, as you did the Netherlands, for a *rival* power, and to provide colonial sinecures and offices in sugar islands, converted into *hells* for the infliction of torture on your fellow-creatures,—hear, and *look at home*, how you have governed and elicited the resources of our great dependency, placed at the threshold, in the very bosom of the empire!

Who can revert to the history of the Oligarchy without indignation? Rotten boroughs and tithes, as much as sinecures, pensions, and exorbitant salaries, have been the great obstacles to sound national policy. The holders and expectants of these are ever bandied together, no less by a sense of common iniquity than common interest, to oppose every salutary amelioration. On every public occasion, on every general election, the priest and the placeman unite to oppose the enemy of imposture and speculation: from these we can have no hope; it is only from the People, from those who suffer, not those who participate in abuse.

But why these heart-stirring sounds of conflict and triumph from Gallia's land! The tri-coloured flag again unfurled, the tocsin sounding, the sovereignty of the people proclaimed, and a knell pealing throughout Europe the doom of despotism, of ecclesiastical oppression, of aristocratic privilege, and every remnant of feudality! The news of the transcendent events, in the memorable month of July, has just reached us. France, the exhaustless source of moral and political phenomena, has again astonished the world. The Holy Alliance is smote to the heart, and all its machinations, all its confederacies and treaties, open and covert, scattered to the winds. What valour has so gloriously achieved, may wisdom and temperance preserve! Our souls are refreshed with hope; we are cheered in the midst of our labours. Those abuses we have exposed and the thousand more remaining behind, and against which reason and justice might have long vainly remonstrated, will now stand a chance not only of being heard but redressed.

DIGEST OF THE IRISH BENEFICES, FROM THE DIOCESAN RETURNS.

DIOCESES.	Benefices with Cure of Souls.	Number of Parishes constituting Benefices.	Churches.	Benefices without Churches.	Unions.	Glebe Houses.	Benefices without Glebe Houses.	Benefices without Glebe Lands.	Incumbents resident.	Incumbents absent.
Armagh	78	103	81	1	11	74	4	4	67	11
Cashell and Emly	57	131	40	17	31	34	23	15	34	23
Clogher	44	46	51	4	2	31	13	3	25	19
Clonfert and Kilmacduagh	14	61	15	1	14	8	6	0	9	5
Cloyne	78	123	59	20	27	22	55	33	33	45
Cork and Ross	77	107	65	14	18	30	47	28	31	46
Derry	54	57	54	2	2	44	10	3	38	16
Down and Connor	79	123	81	5	26	45	34	28	54	25
Dromore	23	26	25	0	1	16	7	4	15	8
Dublin	87	151	83	11	28	41	46	38	49	38
Elphin	37	91	30	7	17	16	6	15	19	18
Kildare	43	72	28	19	19	12	31	20	18	25
Killala and Aconhry	20	52	20	0	12	15	4	1	14	6
Killaloe and Kilfenora	51	129	50	5	36	39	12	9	36	15
Kilmore	33	41	36	0	6	23	10	0	20	13
Leighlin and Ferns	92	182	95	6	45	39	53	38	69	23
Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe ..	105	165	69	5	39	37	68	51	50	55
Meath	101	211	94	11	42	83	18	6	76	25
Ossory	59	135	47	13	22	35	24	13	33	26
Raphoe	26	31	32	0	1	23	8	2	20	6
Tuam and Ardagh	49	124	47	3	27	33	15	6	31	18
Waterford and Lismore	63	98	38	18	27	17	35	26	22	41
	1270	2259	1140	192	453	717	529	343	763	507

Remarks on the Digest.

A few explanations respecting some of the dioceses, collected principally from the observations of the bishops accompanying their returns to Parliament, may not be improperly appended to the preceding tabular digest.

Armagh contains, according to Dr. Beaufort's map of Ireland, 468,550 acres; divided among 103 parishes, gives 4,567 acres of tithes for each; the glebe lands average in each, 219 acres.

Cashell and Emly contains 131 *parishes*, but only 57 *benefices*. The resident parsons are 34, the absent 23. The benefices returned contain 272,391 acres, averaging 5,044 to each, besides houses and glebes: the value of land in the diocese makes the tithes of each benefice, at 5s. in the pound on the rental, amount to £2,837 a-year: the cost of administering church rites in this diocese is about £110 a-year for *each Protestant family*.

Clogher has, out of 44 parsons, only 25 resident. As the late bishop JOCELYN made no return of tithes in any benefice, there is no stating particulars.

Clonfert contains 710 Protestant families, 2,769 Catholic. The tithes, according to Wakefield's valuation, reckoned at only four rents, would amount to £88,000 per annum, or £6,300 for each incumbent. Five incumbents are absent, and nine resident. The bishop says that the old division of tithes into FOUR PARTS is still retained in his diocese: we suppose, however, the Bishop and the Priest now divide the two parts formerly intended for the poor and the repairs of the church.

Cloyne has 78 parsons; 45 of whom are non-resident.

In Cork 11 parsons out of 20 are absent.

Derry, under Bishop Knox, exhibits a singular spectacle: the Dean has three glebes of 1,530 acres freehold, deanery-house, and the tithes of 89,600 acres. The whole diocese contains 16,347 acres of glebe, which gives an average of 320 acres for each parson, besides all tithes. A tenth-part of a district, containing 200,000 inhabitants, is thus shared among FIFTY-FOUR clergymen, besides an estate of 320 acres. For the Bishop's relations, see Knox in the *List of Pluralists*.

Dublin has only 49 resident parsons out of 78. There are thirty-one deaneries, chancellorships, prebendaries, &c. in the diocese, but no return of the glebe and estates annexed to these offices and sinecures.

Kildare has 25 *absentees* and only 18 *residents*. There are two appropriations in this diocese without any return; one belonging to the Bishop appears to be very extensive, and yields to him the tithes of TWENTY different townships or places—they probably contain 40,000 or 50,000 acres.

Killala and Achonry contain 52 parishes, compressed into 20 benefices, with fourteen resident and 6 absent parsons, enjoying the tithes of 708,800 acres, to administer church rites to 562 Protestant families.

The tithes only would yield £300 a-year for EACH PROTESTANT FAMILY, supposing land worth only twelve shillings per English acre. Notwithstanding this COSTLY management, it appears that, from 1776 to 1792, the Catholics increased from 6 to 1 to 60 to 1—that is in a *ten-fold proportion*!

Killaloe. By the Return, 28 benefices in this diocese yield 674,008 acres, averaging 24,071 acres to each benefice. The average rent, by Wakefield, is 33s. per acre. Taking the tithe at one-fourth the rent, these benefices would be worth £9,929 a-year each. Eight sinecurists hold THIRTY-TWO parishes without even the *cure of one soul*.

Kilmore contains 30 benefices, the GLEBES alone of which amount to 11,026 acres, averaging 367 acres of freehold each, probably worth £450 a-year. Surely these freeholds are quite ample, without any tithe whatever, for reading the church service to A FIFTH of the population; but if, in addition to the £450 a-year, freehold, besides houses, demesnes, &c., each possess (like the pluralist Wynne) 30,000 acres of tithe—what a picture!

Waterford contains 18 resident, 32 absent clergymen. The tithes of this diocese are very valuable, and are appropriated to administer religious rites to 1,375 persons out of 108,625. The number of Catholics in 1792 were 108,625; Protestants 1,375. In 1776 the Catholic families were 76,519; Protestants 2,879. The Catholics, during that interval, therefore, increased from 6 to 1 to 80 to 1. So much for the efficacy of tithes in supporting the reformed religion.

* * * For a List of Irish Pluralists, see APPENDIX.

OF THE

REVENUES OF THE CROWN.

ROYALTY, after all, is an expensive government! What is a king without an aristocracy and a priesthood? and what are any of these, unless supported in splendour and magnificence? It is a system in which men are sought to be governed by the senses rather than the understanding, and is more adapted to a barbarous than civilized state. Pageantry and ceremony, the parade of crowns and coronets, of gold keys, sticks, white wands, and black rods; of ermine and lawn, and maces and wigs;—these are the chief attributes of monarchy. They are more appropriate to the state of the king of the BIRMANS or of the ASHANTEES than the sovereign of an European community. They cease to inspire respect when men become enlightened, when they have learnt that the real object of government is to confer the greatest happiness on the people at the least expense: but it is a beggarly greatness, an absurd system, that would perpetuate these fooleries amidst an impoverished population,—amidst debts, and taxes, and pauperism.

In treating of the revenues of the crown it will be important to observe the distinction between the ancient patrimony of the sovereign, denominated the hereditary revenues, and the modern parliamentary grant, substituted in lieu of them, called the *Civil List*. Of the nature of the latter—the various charges upon it in the maintenance of the king's household and other disbursements—of its extravagant amount during the profligate reign of George IV. and of the total burthen entailed by the royal expenditure on the people, we shall treat in the next chapter. In the present we shall confine ourselves to an exposition of the amount, the application, and management of the hereditary revenues; consisting of the landed possessions of the Crown, of Admiralty droits, Gibraltar duties, Leeward-Island duties, the property of persons dying intestate without heirs, forfeiture in courts of justice, the incomes of bishoprics during vacancies, surplus of the Scotch civil list, profit on waifs, shipwrecks, treasure-trove, and other minor sources. Parliament having granted a specific annuity, out of the taxes, for the support

of the dignity of the Crown, the public has been constantly made to believe that the produce of the hereditary revenues has been appropriated to the wants of the state. This, it will be shown in the sequel, has been a complete and egregious delusion. It will be seen that the ancient revenues of the Crown have been left at the uncontrolled disposal of ministers. That they have been chiefly expended in objects personal to themselves, the king, or royal family; in pensions and grants to their parliamentary supporters, their relatives, and adherents; in the purchase of tithes and church-patronage; in occasional charitable donations, ostentatiously granted, under pretext of mitigating the sufferings of distressed artizans and manufacturers; in payments into the privy purse, for the more lavish support of court prodigality; in the building and pulling down of palaces; in payments for defraying the expense of the royal household, and other outgoings, which ought to have been defrayed out of the civil list: in short, it will be seen that, for the last seventy years, the public has not only been burthened with an enormous provision for a civil list, but, by an extraordinary kind of ministerial management, has failed to derive any advantage from those funds, in lieu of which a civil list was specially granted.

For obvious reasons, the leading men in the House of Commons have always manifested great reluctance to touch on these subjects. Although it is well known the income of the late king exceeded that of his predecessor by more than HALF A MILLION, not one of our advocates—not even our more ostentatious patriots—Brougham, Hume, Russell, or Graham—ever brought the shameless extravagance fairly before the country. It is possible, as we have hinted, there may have existed reasons for this complacency towards royal profusion. In spite of the encroachments of the Oligarchy, a king of England possesses great power, and has abundant means of rewarding expectants and supporters: he is not only the fountain of honour, but enjoys, nearly, all patronage in church and state; and the more virtuous aspirants in public life may have felt reluctant to shipwreck all hope of once basking in the sunshine of the court. However, we entertain no delicacy nor reserve on this score; we neither enjoy, nor is it probable we shall, any of the fat emoluments of office. Moreover we consider the sovereign, like other state functionaries, only the servant of the public: and the public sustaining a great burthen on his account, under the pretext that the duties of his office are essential to the welfare of the people, they have clearly a right to be informed of the amount and mode of his outgoings. In what follows it will be seen what a lavish expenditure has been tolerated during a period when successive ministers have been loud and vehement in professing a desire to reduce every establishment to the lowest possible scale, and when it has been often openly and boastingly alleged that economy and retrenchment had been carried to the utmost limit compatible with the national service. Our exposition will also throw light on the workings of the borough-government in its highest departments, and uncover many streamlets of corruption which meander through the upper stratum of our boasted Constitution.

We shall take the several branches of the hereditary revenues in order, beginning with the

CROWN LANDS.

These constitute the remains of the ancient patrimony of the Crown, originally intended to maintain the dignity, and defray the expense of the executive government. Formerly, the kings of England, as of other European states, were supported from the soil, and not by the system of revenue which has been organized in later times. Manufactures and commerce were then almost unknown; of money there was very little, and scarcely any imposts. Gradually kings found out the means of supplying their wants by loading their subjects with taxes, which rendered the revenue derived from their private domains of less importance; and hence, contemporaneously with the progress of fiscal oppression, we may date the neglect and alienation of the hereditary revenues. The chief remains of these possessions are the crown lands, consisting of parks, forests, chases, manors, fisheries, and royalties; extensive estates, numerous church livings, fee-farm-rents, light-house dues, mines of coal, tin, and copper. The property is situate in almost every part of the kingdom, but principally in the metropolis and vicinity; much of it is in Wales; and there are extensive estates in Ireland. The history and management of these royal endowments, their subserviency to political purposes, and their present state and value, we shall shortly describe. It is a subject of much novelty, and one with which even public men have not taken great pains to be informed. Our information is mainly derived from the Reports of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, from a publication entitled, "*Observations on the landed Revenue of the Crown,*" written by a nephew of the celebrated Viscount Bolingbroke, and from the able speech, last session, of Mr. D. W. Harvey, the member for Colchester.

William, of Normandy, possessed a landed revenue of £400,000 a year. From that period the territorial income of the sovereign declined, till the reign of Henry VIII., when, by the sequestration of the wealth of the religious houses, it was again augmented. The public revenue of Queen Elizabeth amounted only to £500,000, of which £132,000 was the produce of the crown estates. During the Commonwealth a commission was appointed by Cromwell to ascertain the extent of the crown lands throughout the kingdom; and, though the disturbed state of the country, and the jealousy with which the new government was regarded, did not afford him an opportunity of making that property produce as much as it would have done in more tranquil times, yet he disposed of crown property to the amount of two millions sterling. In Cornwall there were 52 honours, manors, and estates belonging to the Crown, of which Cromwell disposed of five or six; but only three or four of the whole number are now remaining in the hands of government. These alienations by the Protector were, after the restoration, made sub-

servient to a system of royal favour and proscription. Those who were artful enough to seize the proper moment for apostatizing from republicanism to royalty were never disturbed in their purchases; while others, who were either too tenacious of their principles, or had committed themselves too deeply by the part they took in the civil war, were compelled to surrender the crown property. Neither Charles II. nor James II. could resist the solicitations of rapacious courtiers, and the hereditary estates were leased, for long terms, to the great families, at almost nominal rents.

But the greatest inroads on the crown estates were committed about the era of the Revolution of 1688. Such was the rapacity of the patriots of those days, and their ingenuity in devising new taxes to defray the royal expenditure, that William III. was induced to grant nearly the whole of the crown estates to his supporters in parliament. One family, that of Portland, obtained a grant of five-sixths of the whole county of Denbigh. In the next reign a compact was, for the first time, entered into between the sovereign and the people, by which a civil list amounting to nearly £700,000 was given to Queen Ann, as a commutation for the land and other revenues enjoyed by her predecessors; and the preamble of the Act is worthy of notice, for its object was stated to be "to defray part of the expense of government, and *lessen the burthens on the subject* by means of the preservation and improvement of the crown lands." How public burthens have been lessened by this and subsequent engagements with the sovereign for a civil list will be strikingly illustrated in the sequel. For the present let us continue our narrative.

In the agreement with Queen Ann, it was settled that no crown estate should be leased at a rent less than one-third of its clear annual value; the remaining two-thirds being left to the disposal of ministers, who thereby were enabled to benefit their friends. Indeed, they often neglected the injunction of the statute, by granting long leases at a rent of a mark, 6s. 8d., 13s. 4d. or other nominal consideration. These abuses afforded a pretext to Shippen, Lockhart, and other members, disappointed in not being permitted a share in the spoil, for introducing a bill, the object of which was the resumption of the crown property obtained by the *heroes* of the Revolution. The bill passed the Commons, but found its grave among the delinquents it was meant to reach, and where many similar acts of utility have been entombed.

From this period nothing more was heard of the crown lands till the accession of George III.: when it was settled that no lease of them should be granted for less than one-eighth of their annual value; the other seven-eighths to be taken in fines. Such, however, was the profligacy of ministers, that they first let the land almost for nothing, and, after taking an estimate of it at that rate, *sold it for nothing*. Thus an estate that was worth £5,000, was leased at a rent of £10, and afterwards sold for £200. An estate, comprising the whole of Piccadilly from Park-lane to Swallow-street, together with all the back lanes, was absolutely sold to the Pulteney family, six years after a lease had been

granted, at the rent of £12:16:10. for £500. This lease is now nearly expired. The fine park of Bowood, in Wiltshire, after being leased at £30 a-year, was sold for £468:10s. The manor of Spalding, of the annual value of £4,000, which, after being held by the trustees of the Earl of Dalkeith for no consideration at all, was leased to the Duke of Buccleugh at £5 per annum, and afterwards entirely severed from the crown without any inquiry whatever. In Yorkshire, the estate of Seaton, and another place, together with the alum-works, were sold to Lord Mulgrave for £27,000, the annual value of which was £2,296, including the alum-works, estimated at £20,000. It does not appear what became of the proceeds of the sale, except that they were paid into the Treasury; they may remain there still, but it is certain they have never been applied to any *known* public purpose. An estate, forfeited by the Earl of Derwentwater, worth £9,000 per annum, was sold to two of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests for £1,000. This was too gross to escape, and two members of the "Collective Wisdom," having dabbled in the transaction, were expelled, and two others reprimanded. It is difficult to say whether the Whigs or Tories *sported* most in these land jobs, but the Whigs had certainly the best of it in the reigns of William III. and the two first princes of the Hanover family.

In 1770 the manor of Newark was granted to the Duke of Newcastle, first Lord of the Treasury, and a nobleman, according to the testimony of the first Earl of Chatham, much addicted to mendacity.* The rent reserved on this grant to the Pelhams was £482, and according to law the fine should have been £3374, instead of which only £200 was paid. The lease was renewed by Lord Grenville, in 1806, for a term of thirty years, at a rent of £2000; the property now consists of 960 acres, covered with dwellings, tolls of bridges, fisheries, and markets, and yields to the proprietor £4000 a-year; and were it let, without reference to electioneering purposes, would yield £7000 a-year. But the great object of the crown-lessee is to maintain his political influence in the borough; for which purpose this property is under-let in small portions to yearly tenants, who are thus constrained to vote for any person the Duke of Newcastle thinks fit to nominate. A striking illustration of the Duke's influence was afforded only last year. Sir W. H. Clinton, differing in opinion with the noble boroughmonger, on the Catholic question, he was compelled to resign his seat for Newark; when his lordship, forthwith, posted down Mr. Sadler as the retiring member's accredited successor. Some of the inhabitants, not liking the idea of a total stranger being crammed down their throats so unceremoniously, rebelled against their lord, voting for Mr. Sergeant Wilde, the opponent of the duke's nominee. This was not to be borne: immediately after the election notices of ejection were served on the rebels; the duke justifying his vindictive proceeding on the tyrant's plea—that he had a right to do "what he pleased *with his own*;" affording a

* Lord Melbourne's Diary, p. 376.

practical commentary of the vast utility of the constitutional maxim, which declares it to be a "high infringement upon the liberties of the people for any PEER to concern himself in the election of members of the House of Commons."

Leaving the noble trader in boroughs, we shall proceed with others. In Lincoln, there was a crown estate valued at £937, let to Sir W. G. Guise, at £37 a-year, as a means of political corruption. The estate of Rosedale, in the mountain recesses of Yorkshire, was held by forty tenants, whose leases expired in 1816, and have since held, from year to year, to the great deterioration of the land. Instead of dividing this property to suit the tenants, many of whom would have been purchasers, it was put up in *one lot*, on the last day of December, when the ground was covered with snow. The reserved bid was £70,000; only £37,000 was offered. These reserved bids are injurious, for they prevent competitors from coming forward. Property at Esham was let to Sir John Shaw for £3920; the crown-lessee put it up to sale in lots, and obtained biddings to the amount of £25,000 and upwards: this, it must be observed, was during the excitement produced by paper-money and war prices. In 1815 a lease was granted to Sir John Throgmorton, at a rent of £115, of property of which the estimated value, upon oath, was £1104. Another property of great importance, called Sunk Island, had been lately rescued from the sea. In the report of the commissioners it is described as a parcel of sandy land, at the mouth of the river Humber. From 1771, it was leased for thirty-one years. In 1802, another lease was granted for thirty-one years, at a rent of £700 for the first year, £2000 for the second, and for the remainder of the term £3100. In the second year of his lease the tenant went to an expense of £10,000, in making banks and in other improvements, and the estate is now let by him for £10,000 a-year. The Reverend John Lonsdale is the crown-lessee, and, apparently, a good judge in land speculations. This estate consists of 6000 acres of the finest soil in the kingdom, tithe free, and worth fifty shillings an acre. In 1812, freehold estates to the amount of £1084 of yearly value were sold at twenty years' purchase; the manor of Eltham, with royalties, lands, &c. for £569; King's Cliffe £148; the manor of the Chapter of Beverley, with all rights, courts, demesnes, and tenements belonging, for £224; and part of the race-course of Newmarket for £154. All these were sold at twenty years' purchase, the land-tax having been previously bought by the Crown at *thirty-nine years' purchase from itself*, and sold again at *twenty years' purchase*. It is needless to remark that manors are highly desirable investments; with courts and royalties annexed, they give a local distinction and importance to the purchasers.

We shall next enter the Woods and Forests, abounding with similar examples of waste and mismanagement as those already cited. Here, again, we meet with the Duke of Newcastle. A broad riding-way was cut for his Grace through Sherwood-forest: the timber cut down was given to his lordship, and the paling raised at each side of the way was charged to the *public* at £1787. Another nobleman had a right of pas-

turage for one horse, in Wolmar-forest, and, for the pasturage of this *single horse*, not less than 450 acres of forest-land were appropriated. Rockingham-forest and an estate adjoining were let to Lord Westmorland at less than *one farthing an acre*! The interests of the crown in this property were valued, so long ago as 1704, at £50,000; they were bought, by Lord Westmorland, for £10,038, in 1796, though the money was not all paid till 1809. With so much indulgence and profuse generosity is it surprising the crown lands have contributed so little to relieve public burthens? Sherwood-forest contains 95,000 acres, and, from 1761 to 1786, the disbursements for management exceeded the receipts by £9037. Some trees, which were blown down in the forest, were valued at £2457; but the produce was only £850, the rest being expended in *fees and allowances* to officers. In the forest of Littlewood there were 5424 acres, and not less than *seventy officers*. During the last-mentioned period the receipts for the crown property, in Wales, amounted to £123,717; the expense of management to £124,466; so that the exchequer was minus, by the principality, £749!

Very inadequate considerations appear to have been received for the *leases of houses* in the metropolis. In 1815, there were no less than thirty-one houses, in Piccadilly and the neighbourhood, let for £125 a-year, a property which, in 1786, was valued at £600, and must now be worth many thousands. Nineteen houses were let in Holborn, near the Turnstile, for £564 and £100 premium, which were worth at least from £100 to £130 each. In the Spring-garden-terrace were three messuages, well worth £200 each, all let for £200 and a fine of £500. Other houses, in Piccadilly and Pall Mall, have been disposed of on terms equally low; the rents must be merely nominal, nothing like what the houses are really worth. A house, No. 17, Charles-street, has been let, upon a thirty years' lease, at £110 a-year. Within a month after the completion of the lease, the tenant let it for £230 a-year; thus clearing more than cent. per cent. by his speculation. The ground-rents of the Crown, in London, produced, last year, £105,000. Reckoning, with Mr. Huskisson, the buildings at only *five times* the value of the ground-rents, the rental of the Crown, when the leases fall in, will be £525,000. What a means of *influence* in the capital! what accommodation it enables ministers to afford their friends and supporters!

Indeed, it is important to remark, who are the tenants of the crown property. Mr. Harvey justly observed that it presented a source of corruption sufficient to contaminate any parliament, and pervert its members to any purpose. Most of the parties involved in the preceding transactions were *peers of the realm* or members of parliament. Out of four hundred and eight tenants to the rental of £200,000 a-year, in 1786, upwards of *two hundred* were men of *TITLE*. Among them were the Duke of St. Alban's, Earl Bathurst, Viscount Bacon, the Duke of Gloucester, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Lichfield, and many other noble lords; for, to speak truth, they were as "thick as the peerage could make them." It cannot be supposed these great

personages would condescend to the humble office of land-jobbers, unless something very substantial was to be gained by it. It is not unusual for peers of parliament and honourable members to take leases of the crown-estates at a low consideration, and then re-let them to sub-tenants at exorbitant rents; but it is not likely they would submit to the trouble and degradation of acting as middle-men, unless the profit was really magnificent.

We must now turn over another leaf. It has been seen on what very low terms, Messieurs, the Commissioners, let and sold the crown lands; we shall, *per contra*, show how very lavish they have been when they had any thing *to buy*,—a residence, for instance, for a brother placeman, or a piece of church-patronage, or a parcel of land to round off the parks, or to improve the view from the palaces, or the unfinished house of an insolvent prince, or a needy peer. Whether they had authority so to apply the proceeds of the land-revenues may be doubted, but that they have done so is certain, and here follows a brief chronicle of a few of their performances.

Within a short distance of Virginia Water was a public-house, the *Wheat Sheaf*; to remove this vulgarity from the favourite resort of the late king it was bought for £5000, and let to Ramsbottom, the brewer, and a M. P. for £50. At Egham, premises were bought for £1100, for which no person, when they were offered for sale, would give £500. The sum of £21,000 was paid for Mote-park. The house of Lord de Clifford, in Spring-gardens, was bought for £4,000 for an *auditor's office*, while the government was letting houses of their own in the same place, and equally fit for the purpose, at £100 a year. In Pimlico, £26,000 was paid for premises to enlarge the mews. In Windsor, a house was purchased from the Honorable John Coventry for £7000, and sold afterwards to the Honourable Mr. Westenra for £6000. A sum of £56,566 was lent to the Duke of York to build a house. Government bought it for £81,000, and sold it again to the Marquis of Stafford for £72,000. In 1805, the *Black Bear*, in Piccadilly, was let under the Crown at a rent of £108; but it became desirable to resume the premises, and the interest of the lessee was valued at £3000. In 1809, the Duke of Richmond disposed of a house to the commissioners for £5,000; but they took the precaution of saying to his Grace, you must give us back £700 of this for damage done in 1791, and so the sum paid was reduced, in this way, to £4300. The *perpetual advowson* of the rectory of St. Mary-le-bone was bought of the Duke of Portland for the sum of £40,000. According to the explanation of Lord Bentinck, his father accepted this diminutive consideration rather than the living should fall into "*bad hands*,"—the Dissenters, who had offered a larger sum.* The bargain has not been very advantageous to the public. The expenses incurred in one year subsequent to the purchase were £10,000. The receipt from pews was only £800, and the rector was paid £2000 a year. But an important object was gained by

* House of Commons, March 30, 1830.

this contract. Ministers secured the ecclesiastical patronage of one of the largest and richest parishes in the metropolis.

Having given specific examples of the management of crown property, and the purposes to which it has been applied, we shall next advert to the general income and expenditure arising from this source.

The property in Ireland has scarcely yet been noticed. It is of the same description as that in England, consisting of estates, composition-rents, quit-rents, and rents of plus acres. The gross proceeds from these sources, in 1796, were £61,340. Since then part has been sold, leaving the Irish rental in 1829, £56,354.

The average receipts from the crown lands in both kingdoms, from 1793 to 1829, has been £560,000 per annum. Of this income a very small portion, indeed, has been available to the public service. In the last three years £1,500,000 was received, and not a *single farthing* was paid into the Exchequer. During the whole term of twenty-six years only £234,000 has reached the Treasury, the remaining balance of upwards of fourteen millions having been expended in the notable bargains of the commissioners already mentioned, in metropolitan improvements, on the royal parks and palaces, in pensions and compensations, and in the salaries of officers and charges of management.

The average expenditure in the three years 1827, 1828, 1829, in the collection of rents, law-expenses, and other charges, was £169,020, being, within a trifle, 20 per cent. on the entire produce of the crown lands. The office of Woods and Forests, including salaries of commissioners, clerks, &c. costs upwards of £18,000; in addition to which £6000, and more, is annually paid for law-charges, and to auditors and assistants. But the greatest and most objectionable objects of disbursement have been the parks and palaces. The total of the ordinary expenditure on St. James's and Hyde Parks, Richmond, Hampton-court, Bushy, Greenwich, and Windsor Parks, was, in 1826, £48,810. In 1827, the expenditure, ordinary and extraordinary, amounted to £92,200. In 1828 it was £116,143. The sums lavished on the palaces has been really prodigious. Nearly £400,000 on Windsor-Castle, and still *unfinished*. The estimated expense of repairing and improving that monstrous and ill-situated pile, Buckingham-Palace, was £432,926; but this did not include the expense of the *SCULPTURE* of a *marble archway*, alone, to cost £35,000, and the commission of architects and clerks, amounting, according to the last report of the commissioners, to £63,343 more.

The formation of Regent-street was estimated to cost £368,000. From first to last it has cost £1,833,000. The rents of the houses do not exceed £36,000, being under 2 per cent. per annum on the outlay. Had not this undertaking been left to the management of Mr. Nash it might, by this time, have produced three or four times the present rental. The Charing-cross improvements were estimated to cost £850,000, they have already cost £1,147,000. The Strand improvements are estimated to cost £748,000, but Mr. Arbuthnot *now* admits there will be an exceeding on this estimate of £95,000.

With the purpose of the street-improvements no fault can be justly found. Some of them already are, and others no doubt will be, both useful and ornamental to the Metropolis; and if the land-revenue had not been drawn upon, recourse must have been had to the consolidated fund. The chief objections that can be urged against them are the disproportion between the original estimate and the expenditure; the questionable taste displayed in some of the plans, and to the individuals employed to superintend their execution. For example, Mr. Nash, according to the report of a parliamentary committee, "became a lessee of the Crown while acting as its agent and surveyor, and in his capacity of the crown-surveyor actually reported on the buildings *erected by himself*, upon the ground of which he was the lessee."* Other and more serious charges have been alleged against this gentleman, but as they have not been so clearly established we pass them over.

Throughout we have used the term *crown lands*; they are in fact not the lands of the Crown, but of the public. Ever since the reign of Queen Ann a *life-annuity* has been granted to the sovereign in lieu of the produce of the hereditary revenues. Hence results the mal-appropriation in lavishing these funds in aid of the royal expenditure. Surely the civil list of the late King was ample enough, not only to defray his personal outgoings, but to maintain his own establishments. The acts of parliament, establishing the administration of the Woods and Forests, require that the revenues arising therefrom shall be expended in objects of *public utility*. Was the purchase of Claremont, as a residence for Prince Coburg, or the giving of a slice off Hyde-park to the Duke of Wellington, to round the area of Apsley-house, objects of this nature? or can the parks and palaces be considered such? These last are often very haughtily and insultingly described as solely for the use, recreation, and enjoyment of the King. Let the King then defray, we say, the expense of them. During the late extravagant reign the people were very contemptuously treated as regards these matters. They were often capriciously excluded from the parks; prohibited from being seen in *certain walks*—restricted from entering here or walking there—and all these fantastic regulations to interdict the enjoyment of their own property, and the expense of maintaining which was defrayed out of their own pockets. Waterloo-place, Regent's Park, and Windsor-park, afford examples of royal or official whims which will be easily recollected. Under William IV. there appears a disposition to conciliate popular feeling, but the treatment of the public by his predecessor was intolerable.

We shall next lay before the reader a return of the present income and expenditure on account of the crown lands. It is for the year ending 5th January, 1829, and is abstracted from the last triennial Report of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. After that we shall subjoin an estimate of the present value of the crown estates, submitted, by Mr. Harvey, to the House of Commons, March 30th, 1830.

* Parl. Paper, No. 343, vol. iii. Session 1829.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE OF THE LAND-REVENUES.

ORDINARY INCOME.

Total balances, 5th January, 1828 £76,957 3 0½

England and Wales.

Fee-farm rents	£ 6,401 13 8
Leasehold rents.....	138,164 17 11½
Profits of mines, manors, &c.	12,315 18 0½
Light-house-dues, &c.	14,705 0 1
Fines	13,027 15 4
Sales of old materials, &c.....	3,471 2 0

188,086 7 1

Ireland.

Quit, crown, and composition rents, and rents of plus acres	56,354 16 7
--	-------------

Island of Alderney.

Rents, tithes, royalties, and harbour- dues.....	127 0 0
---	---------

Isle of Man.

Tithes, quit rents, and alienation-fines..	1,428 7 1
--	-----------

The royal forests, parks, and woodlands	57,910 3 8
	39,972 15 8

Total ordinary receipts, including balances £362,926 9 5½

EXTRAORDINARY RECEIPTS.

Sales of estates and unimprovable rents in England and Wales	139,704 11 1½
The like in Ireland.....	22,949 2 1
Deposits upon sales to be paid	169 17 7

Total income for the year ending January 5, 1829 .. £525,750 0 3

ORDINARY EXPENDITURE.

Ancient stipends, including payments to schools, chapels, churches, &c.	£ 7,486 7 10
Collection of rents, including allowance to receivers	4,241 9 8½
Local disbursements by receivers, and allowances to tenants	4,091 1 4½
Expenses of the establishment of Woods and Forests, in- cluding salaries of commissioners, clerks, surveyors, officers, &c.	18,574 6 7
Salaries to auditors and assistants	837 1 8
Law-charges	6,292 5 8
Payments to architects, surveyors, &c. expenses of jour- neys, and other bills	2,849 0 2
Fees on acts of parliament, enrolling of leases, &c.	3,637 0 2
Rates, taxes, superannuation-allowances, &c.....	10,807 19 6½
Expenses on the royal forests, parks, and woodlands....	83,797 3 7½

Total ordinary expenditure £142,616 16 4½

EXPENDITURE OF CROWN LANDS.

129

Brought forward.....£142,616 16 4½

EXTRAORDINARY EXPENDITURE.

St. James's, Greenwich, Hyde, Windsor, and other royal parks	68,388	7	3
In purchase of estates and payment to Board of Works for Buckingham-palace	137,623	13	4
Transferred to the Regent-street fund	116,306	9	3
	464,935	6	2½
Balance, 5th January, 1829.....	60,814	14	5½
	£525,750	0	7½

*Certain Salaries and Miscellaneous Payments in ONE YEAR from the Produce of the Crown Lands.—Parliamentary Paper, No. 294, Session 1830.**

To her royal highness the Princess Elizabeth, ranger of Richmond New Park	£ 109	10	0
To Viscount Sidmouth, deputy ranger of Richmond New Park	1,569	0	0
To Thomas Earl Onslow, out-ranger of Windsor-Forest....	600	0	0
To Viscount Sydney, ranger and keeper of St. James's and Hyde Parks	2,598	0	0
To Dame Harriot Bloomfield, keeper and <i>paler</i> of Hampton Court-House-Park	74	2	8
To the representatives of Sir James Tilney Long, Bart. warden of Waltham-Forest	270	0	0
To General Sir Samuel Hulse, ranger and keeper of the House-Park at Windsor.....	567	10	6
To Lieutenant-Colonel Stephenson, riding forester of New Forest	500	0	0
To Earl Euston, warden and governor of Salcey-Forest	400	0	0
To Earl Harcourt and others, commissioners of Windsor Great Park	5,600	0	0
To William Edward Fauquier, Esq. superintendent of St. James's and Hyde Parks	224	5	2½
Compensations to the late receivers of land revenue, for loss of office	101	8	0
Salary, rent of office, and allowances to clerks, in the department of auditors of the land revenue.....	621	0	6
Salaries in the office of the commissioners of woods, forests and land revenues	3,210	14	10
To the said commissioners, to discharge bills for business executed by Messrs. Driver	1,982	14	2
To the said commissioners, for works at Whitehall, Privy Gardens, and Scotland-Yard.....	223	1	7

Carried forward....£18,651 7 5½

* Some of the salaries and payments in this and the next document will, in part, account for the defalcations in the surplus produce of the crown property, and how little it has contributed, as Queen Ann purposed, to lessen "*public burthens*."

Brought forward....	£18,651	7	5½
To the said commissioners, to defray the expenses of a suit for establishing the title of the Crown to derelict lands ..	1,015	16	9
To the said commissioners, the amount of bills for law business in the land-revenue department	750	0	0
To the treasurer of the navy, the balance of rents arising from the Northfleet estate	2,626	18	2
Arrears of an annuity payable to the lessee of the Hempholme estate on account of improvements	2,206	2	9
To the porter of the outward gate of Windsor-Castle	25	0	0
Annuity payable out of escheated premises in the Borough of Southwark	30	7	6
Taxes assessed on Hampton-Court-Park.....	100	0	0
Compensations to officers of his Majesty's household, for loss of premises in Scotland-Yard.....	470	11	0
To the governor and receiver-general of the Isle of Wight, the surplus on his account	378	5	8
Purchase-money of ground adjoining the Chertsey estate ..	12	0	0
Tithes payable out of the Hempholme estate.....	1,318	12	9
Compensation recovered from the late occupier of Havering-Park-Farm, and paid over to the lessee	282	4	0
Expenses incurred in repairing and erecting farm buildings, and in draining, cultivating, and improving crown estates	996	14	8½
Expenses attending the recovery of arrears and sale of crown lands; charges of collecting quit-rents and profits of courts, and compounding fines; surveys, valuations, stamps, &c.	283	1	6½
	<u>£29,147</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3½</u>

Establishment for the Management of the Crown Lands.—Parl. Paper, No. 480, Session 1830.

Lord Lowther, first commissioner	£2000	0	0
William Dacres Adam, second commissioner	1200	0	0
Henry Dawkins, third commissioner	1200	0	0
Alexander Milne, secretary	1000	0	0
Ditto, under Charing-Cross Improvement Act	450	0	0
John Thornborrow, chief clerk.....	700	0	0
James King, principal clerk	600	0	0
William Nash Round, first senior clerk	450	0	0
George Cornell, second ditto	450	0	0
John Waller, third ditto	450	0	0
William Drake White, fourth ditto.....	450	0	0
Richard Rosdew Mudge, first assistant clerk	270	0	0
Thomas Hayley Rose, second ditto	270	0	0
Two last-mentioned persons, joint minute clerk.....	200	0	0
Trenham Walshman Philipps, second junior clerk..	160	0	0
Ditto, private secretary to first commissioner	100	0	0
Ditto, for extra services under 7 Geo. IV. c. 77....	50	0	0
Edward Jesse, itinerant deputy surveyor of the royal parks	350	0	0
Ditto, for the keep of two horses	50	0	0

<i>James Weale</i> , gentleman of the ewry in the lord steward's department	£285	0	0
<i>Ditto</i> , clerk for the crown lands in Ireland	600	0	0
<i>Richard Rotton</i> , assistant clerk ditto	270	0	0
<i>John Burke</i> , clerk of quit-rents, Dublin	461	0	0
<i>John Kirkland and William Drake White</i> , } joint-receivers of crown-rents in London and Middlesex, 1000	0	0	0
<i>Edward Driver and George Neale Driver</i> , { receivers for counties of Essex, Rutland, Huntingdon, &c.	£4 per cent. on the rents in their receipt.		
<i>John Bower</i> , { ditto for counties of York and Nottingham			
<i>William Custance</i> , .. { ditto for counties of Lin- coln, Cambridge, and Northampton			
<i>John Walker</i> , { ditto for Wales, Chester, } and Monmouth, }			
<i>Edward Machen</i> , deputy surveyor of Dean-Forest ..	£350	0	0
<i>Ditto</i> , joint deputy gaveller	200	0	0
<i>Robert Turner</i> , deputy surveyor of New Forest	350	0	0
<i>Ditto</i> , allowance for Parkhurst-Forest	50	0	0

ESTIMATE of the Value of the Crown Lands, independently of the Woods and Forests, and of that Portion which may be considered to belong exclusively to the Royal Person.

One hundred and thirty manors and royalties, at £1000	£130,000
Annual rental of estates, £600,000, at 25 years' purchase	15,000,000
Middlesex, ground-rents £50,000 per annum, at 40 years' purchase	2,000,000*
Rents from houses, say £20,000 per annum, at 18 years' purchase	360,000
Waste lands in forests not fit for oak timber, 86,000 acres, at £5 per acre	430,000
Church livings	100,000
Fee-farm-rents, and other unimproveable payments, in England and Wales, at least £6000, at 25 years' purchase	150,000
Allotments under 485 inclosure acts, at £500	242,500
Irish estates	2,000,000
Total	£20,412,500

N. B. The above estimate is exclusive of mines of coal, tin, and copper, and also of the Duchy of Lancaster, £30,000. *Davenant*, in his Treatise on the Lands of England, estimates the common rights of the Crown at 300,000 acres.

* Mr. Harvey committed an oversight in estimating the Middlesex ground-rents at £50,000 per annum. Last year they produced £105,000, and when the leases fall in will be worth £500,000. Instead of *two*, their present worth is, at least, *four millions*. See page 124.

The estimate of the value of the land-revenues does not include the royal forests. In some of these are intermingling rights, and the Crown has no property in the soil. Such are New Forest and the forests of Epping, Sherwood, and Dean Forest; all the right possessed by the Crown consists of the right of herbage for the deer, although in the great forest of Sherwood, comprising a sheet of land of 95,000 acres, not a single deer is kept. In the New Forest, out of 90,000 acres, the Crown has the right to enclose periodically 6,000 acres, which may be dissevered from the pasturage for the growth of timber. The most valuable property undoubtedly consists of the estates and leaseholds alone worth upwards of *twenty millions* sterling. These might be sold without encroaching on any possession in the least conducive to the dignity and enjoyment of the sovereign. What *dignity*, indeed, can there be in the king or his servants being jobbers in land, or hucksters in the sale of houses, leases, and ground-rents?

It is not, however, the dignity nor the comfort of the king, but the patronage of his ministers, that is at stake. The preceding narrative has shown what an endless source of jobbing the crown-lands have been for centuries; of jobbing the most foul, rapacious, and iniquitous. Not only have the commons, but the distinguished names of the peerage—the great historical cognomens—been implicated in these peculating transactions. This description is not limited to the times of the Edwards and Henries, when there was no law to contravene the sovereign's pleasure, or the sordid practices of his servants, but applies to the period subsequent to the Revolution, when the constitution is supposed to have been purified and perfected. Acts of parliament, indeed, were passed prescribing the minimum of rent (relatively to the full value) at which the crown-farms should be let,—namely one-third before the reign of George III. and one-eighth after the accession of the said king, stating, too, that, under the former regulation, two-thirds of the valued rack-rent, and, under the latter, seven-eighths should be paid in the shape of fine. But what of these statutory restraints? They were all set at nought; the “creatures were at their dirty work” again; and, in most cases, the rents reserved and the fines exacted were merely nominal. May it not be said, after this, that *ministerial responsibility* is a farce, and that it is sheer fatuity to expect justice will be enforced against public defaulters, when the accused and his judges are alike participant in the delinquency?

The sale of the crown-lands would not only cut off a dangerous source of ministerial influence, but render them more conducive to national wealth, and effect a saving in the public expenditure. That costly establishment, the Board of Woods and Forests, might be abolished. Mr. Huskisson long depastured in this retreat, and retained to the last a singular partiality for the existing mode of administering the crown-property. In the debate on Mr. Harvey's motion, he observed that the House had no right to dispose of the hereditary revenues of the Crown *without its consent*. No one could gainsay this constitutional truism. No doubt an act of parliament would be requisite, and every one knows

an act of parliament is not law till it receives the royal assent. In this, then, there is nothing peculiar. But the importance ascribed by the honourable member to the fact, that the royal forests formed a valuable nursery for the growth of timber, seemed a little inconsistent with his favourite principles of free trade. England depends much more on the produce of her looms and steam-engines than of her woods and forests. Agreeably with the dogmas of the school of which Mr. Huskisson had long been a distinguished ornament, our supply of timber would be most advantageously obtained from the wastes of Canada or Norway, where it can be cheapest produced; while our own acres are best appropriated to the growth of cheap bread for the artisan and manufacturer.

DROITS OF THE CROWN AND ADMIRALTY.

The next and most important branch of the hereditary revenues of the Crown are the droits of admiralty. These *droits*, or rights, are received by the king, in his capacity of lord high admiral; the duties of which office are discharged by seven lords commissioners. The principal sources whence the droits are derived are the following:—all sums arising from wreck and goods of pirates; all ships detained previously to a declaration of war; all coming into port, either from distress of weather, or ignorant of the commencement of hostilities; all taken before the issuing of proclamation; and those taken by non-commissioned captors are sold, and the proceeds form droits of admiralty.

From this description of the sources whence the droit-fund is constituted, it evidently appears little better than buccaneer or piratical plunder, obtained under circumstances little creditable to any government to sanction. Ships detained previously to a declaration of war, coming into port ignorant of hostilities, or taken before the issuing of a proclamation, are all considered lawful prizes: the sufferers, in these cases, violate a law of which they are ignorant, and of which it is impossible they should have any knowledge. They are caught in a spider's web impervious to the sight. An *ex post facto* law, or the laws of the Roman tyrant, who placed them so high that they were illegible to the beholder, were not more unjust and tyrannical. In the course of the late war—in the attack on the Danes, and the seizure of the Spanish ships—we had two memorable instances to what base purposes this principle may be applied. In the attack upon Copenhagen, government might be actuated by its fears as well as its cupidity; they might dread the Danish ships of war falling into the hands of Bonaparte; though, in either case, it was equally disgraceful to a great nation to be excited to an act of flagrant injustice and violation of international law. But what can be urged in defence of the attack on the Spanish ships in 1805? The object, in this case, unquestionably, was plunder for the droit-fund. There could be no fear of the Spanish ships joining the enemy, because they were merchantmen, and not ships of war. We were at peace; the Spanish envoy, in London, and the English ambassador, at Madrid, were carrying on a negotiation, and yet, under these circumstances, a squadron of ships of war was fitted out; the homeward-bound Spanish fleet,

from South America, loaded with treasure, attacked, the crews massacred, the ships burnt, and the proceeds of this unhallowed enterprise condemned as *rights of the Crown*!

Posterity, in looking to the foreign and domestic policy of England for the last forty years, will be at a loss which most to condemn—the encroachments on the liberties of the people, or the atrocious attacks on the right of other states. The balance of iniquity seems nearly equal. At home, the liberty and property of the people have been assailed by the Bank-Restriction-Act, Seditious Meeting Bills, new Treason Acts, and acts for the curtailment of the liberty of the press. Abroad, we may reckon among the catalogue of offences, the attacks upon Copenhagen and the Spanish fleet and the affair of Terceira: to which may be added, our slow and reluctant recognition of the independence of the new States of South America—our suspicious neutrality, when the liberties of Italy and Spain were subverted by the interference of foreign armies—and the promptitude with which we have availed ourselves of every pretext for either openly supporting or covertly aiding all the old European despotisms in their machinations against popular rights.

To return, however, to the Droits of Admiralty. The monies accruing from the droits, as well as the crown-lands, and other branches of the hereditary revenue, were ostensibly conceded to the public, in lieu of the grant of a fixed sum for the civil list. But, instead of being made available to the national service, they have always been kept in the back ground, and indirectly expended, without either the people or their representatives having any control over them, further than an occasional return of the objects on which they had been lavished. The management of the fund is not more extraordinary than its application. It is not paid into the Exchequer, like the taxes, but remains in the hands of the registrar of the high court of Admiralty, the receiver-general of droits, the commissioners of prizes, and the Bank of England. There is no responsibility attaches to the persons receiving or issuing this money. No account is kept of the receipts and outgoings at the Treasury. It is drawn out of the Bank of England, not on the authority of the privy-seal, but of a warrant under the sign manual only. In short, it is a fund wholly out of the control of parliament; and it is entirely at the disposal of the ministers of the Crown: it may be expended on the hirelings of the press, in rewarding spies and informers, in purchasing votes of members of parliament, in bribery at elections, in minions or mistresses, or any other purpose of royal or ministerial corruption.

The specific objects for which the admiralty droits were granted to the Crown were for “*guarding and maintaining the rights and privileges of the seas* ;”^{*} so that the whole of the fund, agreeably to its original destination, ought to have been expended on the ships, officers, and men of the English navy. How differently it has been

^{*} Mr. Brougham, Parliamentary Debates, vol. xxi. 245.

applied we shall proceed to illustrate; instead of being devoted to maritime objects, it has been dissipated in rewarding the questionable services of individuals—in discharging the arrears of the civil list—in payments to Sir William Knighton, for the use of the *privy purse*—in advances to different branches of the royal family—paying tradesmen's and physicians' bills—defraying the expense of visits from foreign princes, and of royal visits to Ireland, Scotland, and Hanover—and, in general, in discharging any casual debt or expense which the caprice or extravagance of royalty and its servants might incur.

In looking over the returns to parliament of the disbursements to individuals, the first that struck us as singular were two payments to the editor of a *ministerial* newspaper, namely, to Dr. Stoddart, now Sir John Stoddart, and a judge in the island of Malta. Next we came to a grant to Sir Home Popham, to indemnify him for losses he had sustained in his famous smuggling voyage. This gallant officer, it seems, had entered various investments outwards, in a ship called *Etrusco*, commanded by Sir Home, and bound from one of the ports of Italy to the East Indies. Captain Robinson, appointed on that station for the prevention of smuggling, seized the vessel and her cargo, value £25,000; being contraband or smuggled goods, was condemned as good and lawful prize. Dr. Lushington having moved for various papers relative to this transaction, it appeared, by a warrant of the Treasury, signed Charles Long and others, as lords of the Treasury, that the loss of £25,000 sustained by Captain Popham, *in smuggling*, was made up to him by a grant of the same sum out of the *Droits of Admiralty*. When all the documents relative to the affair were upon the table of the house, and Mr. C. Long and Sir Home Popham, being both members, were present, Dr. Lushington moved “That Sir Home Popham, in being detected in knowingly carrying on an *illegal* traffic, had acted in contempt of the laws of his country, contrary to the duty of a British subject, and to the disgrace of the character of a British officer; and, further, that the grant of £25,000 by Mr. Long to him out of the *Droits of Admiralty*, had been a gross misapplication of the public money.” After solemn debate on this question, not a single fact being denied or disputed, ‘the Guardians of the Public Purse’ fully acquitted Sir Home Popham and Mr. Long of all blame, by a majority of 126 to 57! When one member of parliament can thus give to another such a sum of money as £25,000 out of the *Droits of Admiralty*, it accounts for that *loyal* clamour which has been so often heard in Parliament, of this fund being the *private* property of the king.

The way in which the *Reverend W. B. Daniels*, the author of a work on “*Rural Sports*,” became entitled to £5077 out of the fund for the maintenance of maritime rights, is worth describing.

A Mr. Jacob, the owner of the privateer *Daphne*, captured, in 1799 or 1800, the French vessel *Circe*, worth £30,000, which was condemned as lawful prize, and all claim to the contrary disregarded. The year and day for appeal having transpired, the condemnation became final, and £15,000 was shared among the captors. Ten thousand pounds more lay ready to be distributed. At this point of time, infor-

mation was laid against Mr. Jacob, for having disregarded the 33d of Geo. III. by which the muster of the crew of a privateer before sailing is enacted. On the *letter* of this law they were convicted; the £10,000 stopped; and the £15,000 recovered; all of which became Droits of Admiralty. The mere ignorance of the law was admitted as no excuse for Mr. Jacob, and the result to him was, besides the loss of his prize, costs to the amount of £1700, and utter ruin. From having been in a respectable trade, he was thrown into gaol, and reduced to beggary. But on whose authority does the reader imagine Mr. Jacob and his family were reduced to beggary? Here it will be necessary to introduce the *Rev. Mr. Daniels*. This gentleman, after publishing his work on "Rural Sports," had been confined for debt, and reduced, as Mr. Brougham says, to the rank of a primitive Christian. After all other attempts to patch up his broken fortune had failed, he, at last, turned a broker in evidence, and procured two men, of the names of Thatcher and Guzman, one of whom had been convicted of perjury, and the other had been flogged at the cart's tail, to swear as much as was necessary to convict Mr. Jacob. For this signal service, the Reverend Mr. Daniels received £5077 out of the Admiralty Droits, and the first of his witnesses £87:13:7, as a *gratuity for evidence given!*

Besides the payments to Sir Home Popham, and Messrs. Stoddart and Daniels, there are others quite as extraordinary and unaccountable. There is a sum of £2250 granted to Sir George Young, on the 20th of September, 1803, being one-third of the Dutch ship Frederick, taken at the Cape. This item is remarkable, because at the time Sir George is represented capturing ships at the Cape, he was serving in parliament as member for Honiton, filled a lucrative situation, and, on failing in a subsequent election, was appointed governor of that Colony. The Earl of Dunmore is also down for the sum of £2792, under similar circumstances. Lord Stowell is inserted for £932, "for services in deciding upon cases relative to American captures." There are two grants to Lord Keith of £20,521 and £1800, to make up losses he had sustained from an action brought against him for *wrongfully* detaining an American ship at the Cape of Good Hope. There is a grant of £700 to one Captain Temple, to defray the expenses of a prosecution for the alleged murder of a seaman, of which crime he had been acquitted; and another grant of £219 to a Turk, for some losses he had sustained at Constantinople.

The objects for which all these grants have been made appear very questionable and mysterious. Let us now come to the larger sums. To that pious nobleman, Lord Gambier, the great patron of Bible Societies, and to Lord Cathcart, is the enormous sum of £348,621, as their share of the *prize-money* at the memorable expedition to Copenhagen. There is another enormous payment to one John Alcock, "to be by him paid over to the merchants, &c. trading to Spain, whose property had been sequestered in 1796 and 1797." Another singular item of £54,921 is entered as an "indemnification to sundry commanders of his Majesty's ships for condemnations, by a Court of Vice-Admiralty, at Cape Nicola Mole, *afterwards found not to have jurisdiction.*" A sum of £887 to Captain Spencer, in the year 1807, pursuant to his Majesty's war-

rant; £10,000 and £1900 to William Bourne and others, as commissioners of Spanish and Portuguese property.

The complexion of all these grants is bad enough. We shall now speak of the immense sums taken out of this fund by the different branches of the Royal Family; and the reader must bear in mind that these grants are independent of the enormous sums they derive from other sources. The droits have formed an inexhaustible mine for relieving the necessities of the king, the regent, the princes, and princesses, in all their embarrassments. The facility with which money was granted by different ministers from this fund, and by none more so than the Whigs, rendered economy on their part wholly unnecessary. Prior to 1812, there had been taken from the droits the enormous sum of £760,000, simply for the payment of the tradesmen's bills of the king's household. The sums granted in aid of the civil list, from 1793 to 1818, amounted to £1,324,000. The sums paid during the same period, to different branches of the royal family, amounted to £266,331:17:3. Besides these sums, £58,000 was granted to defray the expenses of additional buildings and furniture at Brighton. The sum of £14,579, for additional expenses in the household, occasioned by the visits of foreign princes. The expenses of the *royal visits* to Ireland, Scotland, and Hanover, amounting to £70,000, were paid out of the Admiralty droits. From the same inexhaustible fund is the royal dole of £5000 to the poor of Spitalfields. Doubtless this act of charity would have been more gracious had the donation proceeded from the privy purse instead of from a fund which, if it does not belong to the nation, unquestionably belongs to the ships, officers, and seamen of the navy. The last payment out of the droits we shall notice is one in 1829, to John Calvert, Esq, £9,166, to defray the expenses incurred in fitting up and furnishing the house of his Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence.

With the exception of the very inadequate payments to captors, we have mentioned the principal purposes to which the droits have been appropriated since the commencement of the late war. The following statement, abstracted from a return to parliament, will show the total produce of this great naval or rather ministerial fund, from 1793 to 1818:—

A SUMMARY ACCOUNT of all Monies received as Droits of the Crown and of the Admiralty, from the 1st of February, 1793, to the 29th of May, 1818. Ordered to be printed, June, 1818.

	£	s.	d.
Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty.....	5,077,216	9	0
Receiver-General of droits	489,885	10	9
Commissioners for the care of Dutch droits	1,286,042	6	10
Commissioners for the care of Spanish droits.....	1,293,313	19	7
Commissioners for the care of Danish and other droits	348,261	6	5
Total.....	£8,494,719	12	7

A period of peace is not favourable to an accumulation of Admiralty droits. Accordingly we find, from the date of the above return up to the annual return to Parliament last session, the proceeds from naval droits have not averaged more than £120,000 per annum.

FOUR-AND-A-HALF PER CENT. DUTIES.

Notwithstanding the efforts of political writers to expose the manifold abuses of the Borough System, an immense number still remain, of which the public have no knowledge, and of which they have scarcely any means of obtaining information. Where, for instance, previously to the expositions afforded by this publication, could satisfactory information be obtained relative to the crown lands, the civil list, droits of Admiralty, and the other branches of the hereditary revenues of which we are about to treat? Correct information on these important subjects can only be acquired from parliamentary reports and papers, to which few persons have access, and still fewer leisure to peruse and digest their voluminous contents. Unquestionably this was a defect in the political knowledge of the people, which we have attempted to remedy, and we have little doubt that the mystery which has heretofore involved the crown revenues, and concealed their amount and application from the community, will be hereafter dissolved.

After the Admiralty droits, the next considerable branch of revenue, at the disposal of ministers, is the Four-and-a-Half per Cent. Leeward-Island Duties. This fund produces from forty to fifty thousand pounds a-year, and consists of a tax of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. imposed on produce in the island of Barbadoes and Leeward Isles. It was created by a colonial law of Barbadoes, nearly two hundred years ago, and, by the terms of the act, was to be applied to the erection of *public buildings, the repair of courts, and other colonial purposes*. In the reign of Charles II. it was seized by the courtiers, and continued to be abused till the reign of Queen Ann; when, on a representation of the abuses of the fund, it was formally renounced by the queen and parliament in favour of the island of Barbadoes, and the original purposes of the act creating it. It again fell into abuse; the natural children of the king and royal dukes, the members of both houses of parliament, their relatives and connexions, having got almost entire possession of the fund. The parties in the smuggling transaction related above are inscribed here. The gallant Sir Home is dead, but his pension of £500 survives, being a reversion payable to his widow. Charles Long's pension (now Lord Farnborough) of £1500 is dated February 7, 1801,* consequently, this noble lord has received £43,500 principal money from the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund. He was an especial favourite of George IV. and is now a *lay-pluralist*, filling several places; but all appear insufficient to reward his *public services* without providing his widow a pension of £750, payable on his death.

* Parl. Paper, No. 273, Session 1830.

The late General Crauford was a pensioner, till his death, on this fund, to the amount of £1200 a-year. The way in which this officer entitled himself to £1200 a-year for life is deserving of attention. Every body remembers the fatal expedition to Walcheren, when forty thousand men were suffered to perish in that pestilential climate, owing to the incapacity of Lord Castlereagh and the duplicity of Mr. Canning. When this business became matter of discussion in the House of Commons; when it was made apparent to every man in England that it was to the squabbles and ignorance of these men that this great national calamity was to be attributed; it was, nevertheless, resolved, by a majority of two hundred and seventy-five, to negative the censure which was moved by Lord Porchester (now Lord Carnarvon) against ministers on that occasion. But the triumphs of ministers did not stop here. A vote of *approbation* of the ministers was absolutely moved and adopted by a majority of two hundred and fifty-five. The member who had the effrontery to move this vote of approbation was General Crauford. But this officer had a further claim on ministerial gratitude: he had recently become connected by marriage with the Duke of Newcastle; he represented and commanded the parliamentary interest of that nobleman; he had *eight votes* to give to ministers on any occasion.

Many other names, not without celebrity, are inscribed on the 4½ per cent. duties: The famous pension to *Edmund Burke* continues to be paid out of this fund. It is entered to "*the executors of Mrs. Burke* £2500," and the date of the grant being the 24th of October, 1795, the public, up to this time, has paid, in principal money, £87,500. How much the world has benefited by the labours of Mr. Burke may be collected from the sublime events daily transpiring in Europe. The sole object of this celebrated renegade in his writings and speeches was to stop the progress of knowledge and liberty—to perpetuate the old feudal despotisms—and he might as well have attempted to stem the progress of the great deep. All he effected was to delay their *fall*, and so far as he contributed to that he was instrumental in the useless sacrifice of millions of lives. Events have proved this to be the issue of all the efforts of this infatuated oracle—for oracle he is thought by some—and the services of both him and his followers will appear to posterity as ill-timed as the vain endeavours of those who, in the later ages of idolatry, sought to oppose the subversion of a barbarous worship. The defect of Burke and his admirers is their blindness the fact that the world is undergoing as great a revolution as when the popular mind was converted from Paganism to Christianity.

The next name is lady *Augusta de Ameland*, £1292: as she died since the return, we shall tread lightly on her grave. All we know of her ladyship is that she was united to the Duke of Sussex, in Italy, by a sort of Gretna-Green marriage, and afterwards repudiated in consequence of that offspring of German pride and feudality—the royal marriage-act. Next follow the five Misses *Fitz-Clarence*, £2500; these

are the natural daughters of the king, by Mrs. Jordan, and will, no doubt, be better taken care of hereafter. The Duke of Gloucester, £1000; the Princess of Hesse-Homburg, £1000; Lord Hood, £1500; Sir William Sydney Smith, £1250; the Earl of Chatham, £3000; and, in trust for Lady G. Tekell, £300; and for the *seven* children of Lady Lucy R. Taylor, £139:10 each. Lady Hester Lucy Stanhope brings up the rear with a pension of £900; she is the niece of the "Heaven-born minister," and the same lady, we believe, who astonishes travellers by acting the Amazon, dressing in man's attire, and living somewhere about Mount Sinai or Tadmor, in the deserts of Arabia.

These, we apprehend, are sufficient for specimens. We have passed over several names totally unknown to us, and, we believe, the public. So eager have the *higher orders* been to be established on this fund that pensions have been granted upon it in reversion, and others charged upon it have not yet become payable. Of this latter class is the memorable provision for Lady Grenville, of £1500 per annum for life, in the event of her surviving Lord Grenville. Since Lady Grenville obtained this grant she has succeeded to the great possessions of her brother, Lord Camelford. Lord Grenville holds a sinecure of £4000 out of the taxes, as Auditor of the Exchequer. His eldest brother, the late Marquis of Buckingham, besides his great estates, held the enormous sinecure of the Tellership of the Exchequer, worth, latterly, £30,000 per annum. Lord Braybrooke and Lord Carysfort, who married sisters of Lord Grenville, hold, each of them, through the interest of the family, sinecures that are worth some thousands a-year; and yet, after all, the devoted planters of Barbadoes are to be mortgaged for £1500 more for life. As there is now a great strain upon the borough establishment, we really wonder the premier does not summon every man of the Grenvilles to his aid; there is no family on whose services the Oligarchy have so just a claim; for they are completely bound up with the system; and now that it is perilled by the glorious events in France, all the veterans, the Sidmouths, Eldons, and the rest, who have retired loaded with spoil, ought to be again brought into active service.

The whole amount of pensions payable out of the Leeward-Island duties is £27,466, and £15,338 more in salaries. The entire produce of these duties from 1760 to 1820 was £2,116,484;* and the whole has been lavished on court favourites and the members and supporters of the Oligarchy. Ministers having been frequently rated concerning the application of this jobbing fund, an act was passed, in 1825, prohibiting the grant of pensions from it in future, and providing that the surplus should be appropriated to the support of the ecclesiastical establishment in the West Indies. By this transmutation, nothing was gained to the public; and the ministers lost no portion of their

* Parliamentary Papers, vol. xi. No. 1, Session 1820.

influence, only their patronage became *spiritual*, instead of secular. A scion of Mother Church was planted in a distant land, which, no doubt, will emulate its parent in all her manifold virtues. As we have omitted, in our exposition of the *Church of England*, to give an account of the staff, corps, and endowments of this distant branch of the church establishment, we shall insert it in this place:—

Bishop of Jamaica	£ 4,000	
Archdeacon of Jamaica	2,000	
Seven clergymen, at £300 each ...	2,100	
	<hr/>	£ 8,100
Bishop of Barbadoes	4,000	
Archdeacon of Barbadoes	2,000	
Archdeacon of Antigua	2,000	
Thirteen clergymen, at £300 each .	3,900	
Three catechists, at £100 each	300	
	<hr/>	12,200
		<hr/>
		£ 20,300
		<hr/>
		<hr/>

These worthy gentlemen, after ten years' service, are to have *retiring allowances*: their salaries have hitherto been paid out of the taxes; the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund being so deeply mortgaged in pensions, there is no surplus from it applicable to the purpose.* And the proceeds arising from the *smuggling transactions* in sugar and ginger, in which ministers were recently detected, do not appear to have been applied either to the support of the West-India church-establishment or any other public object. But this is another of those secret modes of *raising the wind* with which the public is totally unacquainted, and which it will be necessary to explain.

It had been usual to remit the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty in the produce of the Leeward Islands, in sugar and ginger; which, like other commodities from the British plantations, were sold for home-consumption at the *long price*, the duty included; and the duty paid over, as by private merchants, to the customs. This continued until the year 1828; previously to which, it has been seen the surplus of the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty had been appropriated to the support of the West-India church establishment. Ministers appear not to have relished the loss of their old fund; they had, it is true, exchanged *lay* for *ecclesiastical* patronage, but they seem to have been anxious to secure both. For this purpose, they hit upon a most extraordinary expedient. They first submitted a case to the Attorney and Solicitor Generals, requesting their opinion whether sugars, granted to the king in kind, and not specially subject to any duty, are liable to the payment of any custom-

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 561, Session 1830.

duty?*

The lawyers, no doubt foreseeing what sort of answer would be most agreeable to their clients, replied in the negative. Upon this, directions were forthwith given to admit the sugars sent in payment of the Leeward-Islands duty without charging the duty of customs, which had been heretofore paid as on all other imported sugars. By this contrivance, Ministers obtained the command of a fund unknown to their predecessors, amounting to betwixt *thirty and forty thousand pounds* per annum—the amount of duty remitted, and precisely to the same amount the general revenue of the country suffered by the defalcation in the produce of the customs appropriated by parliament to the public service. To what extent this evasion of the payment of parliamentary duties, and the raising of money by the power of prerogative, might have been pushed it is impossible to foresee. Ministers might not only have imported sugars in payment of the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty, custom free, but they might, also, by stretching their principle a little further, have imported sugars generally, *for sale*, duty free, and, by retailing them at the usual price, and appropriating the duty, raised a fund for pensions and grants to any amount.

The more we reflect on this affair, the more we are astonished. The idea of the ministers of a great country turning *smugglers*; of resorting to the age of the Tudors and Plantagenets for precedents; of seeking to evade, under shelter of the quibbling opinions of lawyers, the payment of duties imposed by themselves, and devoted to the national service, staggers belief. It establishes, with infinitely greater force than any argument of ours, the vast importance attached, by the servants of the Crown, to those secret and uncontrolled sources of influence we have been exposing, and how essential they deem the exclusive management of them to the *working* of the machinery of government. To shew that our exposition of the transaction is not exaggerated, we shall insert the opinion entertained of it by that useful member, Sir James Graham, and expressed in the following resolution submitted by him to the House of Commons, on the 2d of July, 1830:—

“That to exempt from duty any article of merchandize imported for the Crown, but not intended for the use of the Sovereign, is an extension of the King’s prerogative of dangerous example; and that to levy the parliamentary duties payable upon such articles when sold for home-consumption, and *appropriate the amount thereof without the knowledge and consent* of parliament, is an unconstitutional violation of the privileges of this House.”

We have little further to add respecting the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties. Mr. Creevy, the late member for Appleby, calculated that these duties, from the accession of George III. to the year 1812, had produced £1,600,000. A statement, by the same respected gentleman, of the purposes to which this enormous sum had been applied, is not more

* Treasury Minute, dated 15th April, 1828.

extraordinary, we believe, than correct; and with it we shall conclude our account of one of the most famous jobbing-funds of the Crown:—

Pensions to persons in this country.....	£740,000
Special and secret service-money.....	326,000
Salaries to the Governors of Leeward Islands....	400,000
For civil list expenditure	170,000
To different Secretaries of the Treasury, supposed for electioneering purposes	48,000

SCOTCH CIVIL LIST—GIBRALTAR DUTIES—ESCHEATS—DUCHIES
OF CORNWALL AND LANCASTER—FINES AND PENALTIES.

We shall only briefly notice the remaining branches of the hereditary revenues.

The Scotch Hereditary Revenue forms a *fourth* fund at the disposal of ministers, over which there is no legislative control further than when grants have been irrevocably made from it they are, *pro forma*, submitted to parliament. It yields, annually, above £100,000, and accrues chiefly from crown-rents, customs, hereditary excise, fines, and forfeitures. About *two-thirds* of the produce are paid in pensions, the remainder in donations to the episcopal clergy, to the Caledonian hunt, for providing coach-houses and stables for the barons of the Exchequer, and other objects of apparently no public utility. Scotland seldom or never petitions for *political reform*, and the spring of her scribbling and clamouring loyalty may be easily divined, since in no other part of the United Kingdom is loyalty so well paid, for in no other part are there such ample funds to reward devotion to ministers. The annual value of places and pensions shared among Scotch freeholders and burghmongers is estimated at £1,750,000, equal to half the rental of the kingdom. In the *Third Report of the Committee on Public Expenditure*, in 1808, it is remarked that Scotch pensions, which, at the commencement of the reign of George III. amounted only to 19, in the year 1797 had swelled to 185, and, in 1808, to 351, two-thirds of these pensions being granted to females!

A fifth source of royal income is the surplus of the *Gibraltar Duties*. It is provided, by the original charter, granted to this place, by Queen Ann, in 1704, that, for the augmentation of trade, no duty or imposition shall be imposed upon any vessel trading or touching at the port; and that the goods and chattels of the inhabitants shall enjoy an immunity from taxation. In violation of these chartered privileges various taxes have been imposed, and the chief portion of the proceeds therefrom, during the late reign, were paid over to Sir WILLIAM KNIGHTON for the use of the king's privy purse. These taxes were levied without the authority of parliament, merely on the authority of the governor; and some recent impositions appear a tax on *liberty of conscience*,—one being a capitation-tax, of ten dollars each, imposed on Roman Catholics and Jews. Taxes have also been imposed on licenses to sell spirits, fishing-boats, lighters, and billiard-tables. The surplus of the Gibraltar Duties produced, over and above salaries and charges from 1760 to 1820, between one and two hundred thousand

pounds; in the year ending 5th of January, 1830, they produced £11,498, of which £5000 was paid into the privy-purse. The collector of these imposts resides, we believe, in Lincoln's Inn, and executes his duty by deputy.

The estates of lunatics, bastards, and others dying intestate and without heirs, form a sixth branch of the casual revenues of the Crown, under the denomination of *Escheats*. The proceeds from this source are considerable, amounting, in the reign of George III. to £323,424.* The King's share of the estate of Mr. Newport, a lunatic, amounted to £113,000. Poor *Troutback's* money shared a similar fate—but here “hangs a tale,” which we must explain, and for which purpose we shall first call in Mr. *Waggoner*.

“MR. FREDERICK MATTHEW WAGGONER called in and examined.

“Do you know any thing of the proceedings that have been had with respect to Mr. *Troutback's* will?—I do; he bequeathed £2000 for erecting an *Orphan Hospital*, and the whole of his money, amounting, with accumulations, to upwards of £100,000, to trustees, for erecting an additional wing, or separate building, to the charity school of St. John of Wapping, and for maintaining and educating poor children of that parish.

“Are there as many poor children as would require the funds to educate?—Yes; *more within the parish*.

“Do you think £5000 a-year would not educate the poor of the parish?—The will is for the education, clothing, and maintenance.

“*What has been done with respect to it?*—We understand that it has been set aside by the Court of Chancery; and that the testator having no next of kin, the money *has gone to the Crown*.”—Report of the Education Committee, 1816, page 289.

Sure enough the “*money has gone to the Crown*.” The will was set aside by Lord ELDON, and the property applied to liquidate the royal debts. It was a windfall to the Sovereign, of which, as Mr. Tierney remarked, the public would never have obtained any knowledge, had not the civil list been in arrear, and it became necessary to apply to parliament for an additional allowance.† How the civil list became in arrear it may be worth while explaining. In 1816 the late King, then Regent, had incurred an enormous debt in consequence of living, as he mostly did, in a profuse and riotous manner. The Lord Chamberlain applied to the Lords of the Treasury to know how this debt was to be discharged. The Lords of the Treasury, after much consultation, determined that the debt, amounting to £277,000, should be defrayed partly out of the money bequeathed by Mr. *Troutback*, for charitable uses, partly out of the *Droits of Admiralty*.‡ Thus, the money piously left to *clothe, educate, and maintain poor children*, was applied to pay the furniture-bills, tailor-bills, haberdasher-bills, and bills perhaps of a still less creditable description, of the Prince Regent. It vexes one to see to what base purposes the best of things may be perverted. How many poor children of Wapping the money of *Troutback* would have preserved from the

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 1. Session 1820.

† Hansard's Parl. Debates, vol. 34, p. 272.

‡ Treasury Minute, Parl. Papers, vol. 1, Session 1820.

gallows and transportation it is impossible to say; but is certain, had George IV. been more frugal, or a Prince who thought the welfare of his subjects of more importance than vicious indulgence, the money of *Troutback*, notwithstanding any informality in his will, would have been suffered to go to the noble objects for which it had been so generously bequeathed.

A *seventh* source of royal income is from the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster. When there is no Prince of Wales, or during his minority, and there is no Duke of Cornwall of a proper age to receive the revenues amounting to £15,000 a-year, they are claimed by the crown. The duchy of Lancaster yields an income to the King of £10,000 per annum. Both sums are paid into the *privy-purse*—the nature of which will be explained in the next chapter.

The remaining branches of the Crown-revenues are too unimportant to claim particular exposition. They accrue principally from fines and forfeitures in courts of justice, from green-wax money, from the sale of spices in the Molucca Islands, and from quit-rents and confiscated estates in the West Indies. We shall subjoin a statement of the produce of these and other branches of the Crown-revenues during the entire reign of Geo. III. from a Parliamentary Paper, No. 1, Session 1820.

AN ACCOUNT of the Total Produce of all Funds at the Disposal of the Crown, and deemed not to be under the immediate Control of Parliament, from the Accession of George III. to the Year 1820.

Droits of the Admiralty and Droits of the Crown,	£	s.	d.
from 1760 to 1820	9,562,614	4	6½
4½-per-Cent. West-India Duties, from 1760 to 1820	2,116,484	0	0
An account of the surplus of Gibraltar Revenues, remitted to England, from 1760 to 1820, after discharging garrison-expenses	124,256	10	7
Scotch Civil-List Surplus, from 1760 to 1820, now appropriated as it may arise, under the Act 50 Geo. III. c. 111, in aid of the Civil List in England	207,700	0	0
Escheats to his Majesty, in cases of illegitimacy or otherwise, from 1760 to 1820	214,647	15	0
Escheats to his Majesty, being the property of alien enemies, from 1760 to 1820	108,777	17	8
French West-India Islands, funds arising by sale of lands in the islands; ceded at the peace of 1763	106,300	0	0
Minorca, Martinique, St. Croix, and St. Thomas, and from the settlement of Surinam, while the same were in the possession of his Majesty—Revenues arising from these Islands	159,816	0	7
Quit-Rents, &c. in the British Colonies, and from all other sources not before enumerated, from 1760 to 1820—casual revenues arising from ..	104,865	3	2½

Total.....£12,705,461 11 7

In the reign of George IV. the same sources of casual income yielded about a million and a half, forming, with the income from the Crown-lands, during the period from 1760 to 1830, a total sum of at least THIRTY-FIVE millions. All this mass of unappropriated revenue has been left at the absolute disposal of the minister of the day, and the parliament has not exercised the least control over it, further than that, for the last ten years, it has been permitted, as matter of courtesy, annually or triennially, to look at the accounts after the money had been expended or granted away. The manner in which these great funds have been managed and dissipated has been, we trust, sufficiently illustrated in the course of this chapter. With the exception of the sums expended in metropolitan improvements, they have been expended in additional grants to the royal family and in pensions to the aristocracy, to ministers, their friends and supporters. They have formed a *practical* branch of the English government, of which Mr. Justice BLACKSTONE failed to give any account to his readers, and we have little hesitation in affirming that they had no inconsiderable influence in the ruinous policy of the late reigns. The royal expenditure has always formed a gulph which no man could fathom, and the hereditary revenues were a never-failing source for supplying the prodigality of the king and his servants. Of the studied mystery maintained on these matters we shall cite an instance. In 1777, during the American war, the king's debts amounted to £618,000; papers were produced containing a disguised statement how this incumbrance had been incurred: vast sums were expended in *secret service* money, and half a million was stated under the head of the *board of works*: but then, as Mr. Belsham observes, no one could tell on what palace, garden, or park, the money had been laid out. In short, there is too much reason to suppose that the debts of George III. were mainly contracted in support of the system of war and injustice in which ministers were engaged, in obtaining the baneful influence which silences all opposition, which swept away all traces of public liberty, and laid the foundation of present distress and embarrassments.

The parliament of 1820 was guilty of a culpable dereliction of duty in not seizing the opportunity, presented by the commencement of a new reign, to bring under its immediate cognizance and control the hereditary revenues. Instead of availing itself of the occasion, they were left, as before, to the irresponsible disposal of ministers. After what has been said, it will not be difficult to divine the reasons for this omission; but the people have another and opposite interest. To the misapplication of the Crown-revenues may partly be ascribed their political bondage and social privations: and we fervently trust, on the approaching settlement of the Civil List, the public will be on the alert to rescue these reserved funds from ministerial grasp, and insist that, in lieu of being dissipated on court favourites and parliamentary hirelings, they be appropriated, as originally intended, to the mitigation of national burthens.

THE
CIVIL LIST.

HAVING fully explained the nature, amount, and application of the ancient hereditary revenues, we next come to the modern parliamentary grant, ostensibly substituted in lieu of them, denominated the *Civil List*, which is a sum yearly set apart from the general income for the personal maintenance of the sovereign, to support the dignity of the Crown, and defray certain expenses connected with the civil government of this country.

Since the Revolution of 1688, it has been usual, at the commencement of a new reign, to enter into a specific arrangement with the king, by which the hereditary revenues of the Crown are surrendered in exchange for an equivalent life-annuity. A similar course, it is probable, will be pursued in respect of WILLIAM IV.; and, on the assembling of the new parliament, the settlement of the civil list will form one of the earliest and most important objects of discussion. Public rumour announces a very material reduction in this branch of the national expenditure; and we may observe, in passing, that it is not a *trifling reduction* which will satisfy the just expectations of the country. The reckless, precipitate, and wasteful grant to the late king was wholly indefensible. Without the appointment of a committee, or the examination of a single witness or document, the reign of George IV. was suffered to commence with an augmented income of at least *half a million* above that of George III. which was by no means a scanty allowance. This was far from being the worst part of the arrangement. The Crown-lands, the droits of admiralty, the Leeward-Islands-duties, the Scotch revenue, and other funds, forming, as we have shown, the great sources of parliamentary corruption, were left at the uncontrolled disposal of ministers, to carry on, under a new reign, a similar system of war, injustice, and profusion, which, there is every reason to believe, they had mainly contributed to foster in that of his predecessor. What will be the nature of future regulations we have no means of judging; but, so far as relates to *one* branch of the

subject, we have no hesitation in affirming what the public has a right to expect. The King of the French has reduced his civil list *seventy-five per cent.* and we say that the King of England ought to submit to a similar reduction, or, at least, to the abandonment of HALF A MILLION per annum. Nothing less than this ought to satisfy the people. It is demanded not only in consequence of the successive and uncalled-for augmentations of the civil list in the last two reigns, but, also, from the prodigious alteration in the value of money, and the imperative necessity of economy in every department of the public expenditure.

Before advertng more at length to the reasonableness of this reduction, we shall enter into some preliminary illustrations of the civil-list-expenditure,—the king's household establishment; the privy purse; pensions on the civil list, and other branches of the royal disbursements; and conclude with some observations on the character and policy of the last two monarchs, and the total expense their profusion entailed on the country.

The first, and most important charge on the civil list is the *royal household*. This forms a ponderous establishment, and affords ample scope for retrenchment under a government really wishful to economise. It is the great nursery of indolence, parasites, and courtiers. It is formed upon manners and customs that have long since expired,—upon old *feudal principles*. It not only retains traces of its Gothic origin, but it is formed also on the principles of a *body corporate*; and has its own law-courts, magistrates, and bye-laws.

In ancient times, these establishments were supported on a principle of *purveyance* and *receipt in kind*. The household was then vast, and the supply scanty and precarious. The king's purveyor used to sally forth from under the Gothic portcullis, to purchase provisions, not with money, but power and prerogative. Whole districts were laid under contribution by the jackals of the royal table, who returned from their plundering excursions loaded with the spoils, perhaps, of a hundred markets, which were deposited in so many caverns, each guarded by its respective keeper. Every commodity being received in its rawest state, it had a variety of processes to pass through before it was prepared for the king and his guests. This inconvenient mode of receipt multiplied offices exceedingly; and hence has arisen the butchery, buttry, pantry, and all that "*rabble of places*," which, though profitable to the holder, and expensive to the state, are almost too mean to mention.

Let us hear what BURKE said on this subject, in his *reforming* days:—"But when (says he) the reason of old establishments are gone, it is absurd to preserve nothing but the burthen of them. This is superstitiously to embalm the carcass, not worth an ounce of the gums that are used to preserve it. It is to burn precious oils in the tomb: it is to offer meat and drink to the dead,—not so much an honour to the deceased as a disgrace to the survivors. Our palaces are vast inhospitable halls: there the bleak winds, 'there Boreas, and

Euras, and Cauras, and Argestes, loud,' howling through the vacant lobbies, and clattering the doors of deserted guard-rooms, appal the imagination, and conjure up the grim spectres of departed tyrants,—the Saxon, the Norman, and the Dane; the stern Edwards and fierce Henries,—who stalk from desolation to desolation through the dreary vacuity and melancholy succession of chill and comfortless chambers. When this tumult subsides, a dead and still more frightful silence would reign in the desert, if, every now and then, the tacking of hammers did not announce that those constant attendants on all courts, in all ages, JOBS, were still alive; for whose sake alone it is that any trace of ancient grandeur is suffered to remain. These palaces are a true emblem of some governments; the inhabitants are decayed, but the governors and magistrates still flourish. They put me in mind of *Old Sarum*, where the representatives, more in number than the constituents, only serve to inform us that this was once a place of trade, and sounding with the '*busy hum of men*,' though now you can only trace the streets by the colour of the corn; and its sole manufacture is in members of parliament."*

The great branches of the household are under the direction of the lord chamberlain, the lord steward, and the master of the horse. The office of the lord chamberlain is to take care of all the officers and servants belonging to the king's chambers, except those belonging to the king's bed-chamber, who are under the groom of the stole. He has the oversight of the officers of the wardrobe, of tents, revels, music, comedians, handicrafts, and artizans; and, though a *layman*, he has the oversight of all the king's chaplains, heralds, physicians, and apothecaries. It is his office to inspect the charges of coronations, marriages, public entries, cavalcades, and funerals; and of all furniture in the parliament-house, and rooms of address to the king.

The lord steward has the estate of the household entirely committed to his care, and all his commands in court are to be obeyed; his authority reaches over all officers and servants of the king's house, except those of the king's chamber and chapel. The counting-house, (where the accounts of the household are kept,) the treasurer of the household, comptroller, cofferer, and master of the household, clerks of green cloth, &c. are under his control.

The master of the horse has the charge and government of all the king's stables and horses. He has also the power over equerries, pages, footmen, grooms, farriers, smiths, saddlers, and all other trades any way connected with the stables. He has the privilege of applying to his own use one coachman, four footmen, and six grooms, in the king's pay, and wearing the king's livery. In any solemn cavalcade, he rides next behind the king.

Beside these officers, the lord privy seal, whose office is to put the seal to all charters, grants, and pardons, signed by the king. Before

* Works of Burke, vol. iii. pp. 277-8.—Speech on Economical Reform.

the privy seal is affixed to any instrument, it receives the royal sign manual; it then passes under the signet, which is a warrant to the privy seal; after the privy seal, it receives the great seal from the lord chancellor, which is the *finale*. The performance of these different formalities costs the public, perhaps, £30,000 a-year, while the whole of the duties might be discharged as well by any honest man and his clerk for about £400 a-year. The remaining functionaries are the lord president of the council, whose office is to manage the debates in council, to propose matters from the king, and to report to him the resolutions thereupon; and the commissioners of the treasury may be considered as part of the household.

The little necessity for this immense establishment was sufficiently evident during the limitations on the Regency. At that time the regent discharged all the duties of the executive with only his establishment as Prince of Wales. It did not appear then, no more than now, there was any want of attendance to give dignity and efficiency to the first magistrate. Burke mentions, in his time, that at least one-half the household was kept up solely for *influence*. He also mentions that one plan of reform, set on foot by lord Talbot, was suddenly stopped, because, forsooth, it would endanger the situation of an *honourable member who was turnspit in the kitchen!* Whether the duties of this important office continue to be discharged by a member of the *honourable house* we are not sure; but, in looking over a list of the household, we observe that two *noble lords* occupy situations little inferior in dignity and utility: the duke of St. Alban's is *master of the hawks*, salary £1372, and lord Maryborough is *master of the dogs*, salary £2000. These offices sound rather degrading to vulgar ears; but "*love*," as the poet says, "*esteems no office mean*;" and no doubt it is the *love* of the *sovereign* rather than £3000 of the *public money* which actuates these noble personages. In 1811 there were no fewer than *twenty-six* peers and *four* commoners who held situations in various departments of the household.

The parade of useless offices is not less great, and still more ridiculous, in the counties palatine of Durham and Chester, and the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, and the principality of Wales. These have all separate establishments, sufficient for the government of a kingdom, while their jurisdiction is confined to a few private estates. There are courts of chancery, ecclesiastical courts, chancellors, attorney-generals, solicitor-generals, privy counsellors, registrars, cursitors, prothonotaries, auditors, and all the other mimicry of royal government. They bring nothing into the public treasury, but greatly add to the patronage of the Crown, whose dignity they degrade. In one part of his kingdom the sovereign is no more than prince of Wales; go to the north, and he dwindles down to the duke of Lancaster; turn to the west, and he appears in the humble character of earl of Chester; travel a few miles farther, the earl disappears, and he pops up again as count palatine of Lancaster. Thus does the king, like Matthews in the play, perform all the different characters in his own drama.

Before the reign of George III. no such thing as a *privy purse* was known. The king's income was always considered public property attached to the office, but not to the person of the monarch. The first time any mention is made of the *privy purse*, is in Mr. Burke's bill, in 1782, and then again in the 39th of George III.; but it was not till the time of the regency, when it was vested in the hands of commissioners, that it was recognised as a fixed annual sum, the private property of the king. But though this anomaly has been only recently acknowledged by any public act, it has been deemed a fixed charge on the civil list for the last seventy years. When the sum of £800,000 was set apart for the royal expenditure, the king was at liberty, with the advice of his ministers, to apply what portion of it he thought proper for his *private use*. The sum at first set aside for this purpose was £48,000; and the king's family increasing, it was extended to £60,000. No part of this fund is applied to defray the expense of the household, nor of any other function of the regal office; it is limited entirely to personal expenses, and may be more properly denominated the king's *pocket money* than his *privy purse*. Why it should be separated from the general income of the civil list, unless to gratify a puerile avarice in the monarch, it is not easy to conjecture. From this source, and the revenues of the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster, and payments from the hereditary revenues, the private property of the king is supposed to accumulate.

The next considerable charge on the civil list consists of *pensions* payable chiefly to servants of the household, to the personal favorites of royalty, and to superannuated diplomatists. The total pensions charged on the civil lists of the three kingdoms, amount to upwards of £200,000. Mr. Hume, in 1828, made a strenuous effort to obtain a return of the pensions on the English civil list, to see if room could not be found for the pension of £3000 granted to the representative of Mr. Canning, by which the public might be saved an additional burthen to that amount; but he was foiled in his laudable endeavour, principally by the sophistry of Mr. Huskisson, who himself was inscribed in the return for which the honourable member moved, for a pension of £1200 per annum, the highest sum which could be granted out of that fund, the total amount being limited by law to £95,000 a year. Except the shrewd and provident gentleman we have named, there are few others with any decided claim to public remuneration: we shall insert some as specimens of the rest, extracted from the last return to parliament.

Pensions payable out of the Civil List.

Names.	Date of Grant.	Pensions per Ann.
Letitia Knox		£600 0 0
Earl of Rochford		1000 0 0
Eurian Margaret Egerton		372 10 0
Dame Augusta Ann Cockburn		600 0 0
John Willis, M.D.Jan. 29, 1791		717 0 0

Names.	Date of Grant.	Pensions per Ann.
Lord Glenbervie.....	March 21, 1795	£600 0 0
Ditto	Ditto	600 0 0
Ditto, in trust for lord Minto.....	April 2, 1800.....	1200 0 0
Sir George Shee, to be suspended when holding office, of the annual value of £1200.....	Jan. 10, 1804.....	770 0 0
Sir Charles Abbott, in trust for Eleanor Made- laine Wickham	June 1, 1803	675 0 0
Eliza Maria Campbell	Sept. 16, 1805.....	500 0 0
Thomas John Batt	July 21, 1800	770 0 0
Fanny Maria Lushington.....	Nov. 27, 1813.....	450 0 0
Sir Benjamin Bloomfield.....	Dec. 20, 1817.....	1200 0 0
Lady Augusta Murray	July 27, 1793.....	1200 0 0
Dowager Lady Clare	March 10, 1803	1000 0 0
Elizabeth Maria Shee	Dec. 2, 1803	430 0 0
Baroness Penelope Clarina.....	March 11, 1813	300 0 0
Charles Cameron	Dec. 22, 1819.....	642 0 0
Martha Durell	Aug. 21, 1810	500 0 0
Mary Henrietta Erskine	July 11, 1797.....	400 0 0
Lady Jemima Helen Bentinck	Nov. 19, 1809	300 0 0
Isabella Goddard	May 6, 1812	850 0 0
Gertrude, Charlotte, Marianna, Caroline, Ca- therine, and Elizabeth Hallifax, each	Sept. 2, 1793	60 0 0
Lord Huntingdon	Oct. 4, 1819	770 0 0
Lord Holland, in trust for Elizabeth Bridget Fox	Dec. 4, 1806	1200 0 0
Andrew, George, Edmund, and Margaret Hammond, each.. ..	Feb. 21, 1806.....	194 0 0
Elizabeth Charlotte Wilhelmina Louisa Ame- lia Sophia Jackson	Aug. 5, 1814	770 0 0
Richard Brinsley, Caroline, Jane, Thomas, Francis, Charles, and Helen Sheridan, each.....	March 2, 1818	70 0 0
George Leigh.....	Sept. 6, 1819	898 0 0
Thomas Macdonald	Feb. 8, 1804	770 0 0
James Moore	July 24, 1809.....	1000 0 0
Vicountess Melville	Oct. 11, 1811.....	1200 0 0
Countess-Dowager of Mornington.....	July 13, 1813.....	770 0 0
Duchess-Dowager of Newcastle	March 10, 1803	1000 0 0
Dame Hannah Burrard	Nov. 13, 1815.....	514 0 0
Dame Margaret Nepean	Nov. 2, 1792	643 0 0
Cornelia Jacoba Baroness Radstock.....	Nov. 25, 1814.....	500 0 0
Duke of Richmond, in trust for lady Char- lotte, lady Sophia, and lady Louisa Len- nox, each	Dec. 21, 1819.....	194 0 0
Lord Charles Spencer	Feb. 10, 1806.....	1000 0 0
Robert Southey	March 31, 1807	200 0 0
Lord Walsingham, in trust for George and Thomas de Grey	July 27, 1794.....	1200 0 0
Sophia Walpole	June 30, 1810.....	800 0 0
Lady Ann Cullen Smith	Oct. 12, 1812	770 0 0
Emily and Harriet Magra, to commence on the death of their father, each	Aug. 9, 1805	250 0 0
Harriet Margaret King, to commence on the death of her husband, (now one of the comptrollers of army accounts,) or when- ever he ceases to hold any office of £400 per annum	June 5, 1792	554 0 0

Names.	Date of Grant.	Pensions per Ann.
William Huskisson, Esq. to be suspended when and so long as he shall be in possession of any office or offices of the annual value of £2000	May 17, 1801	£1200 0 0
Dame Anna Bella Gore, to commence from the death of her husband	Jan. 16, 1806	386 0 0
Dame Charlotte Dundas, to commence from the death of her husband	Jan. 15, 1812	1000 0 0

One is at a loss to imagine what public, or other services, could have been rendered by so many *honorable and titled dames*, as crowd this list, to entitle them to become state annuitants. It is possible, since this return was made, one or two may have changed their names, or departed this life; but, in the latter case, as others have doubtless succeeded of similar pretensions, it does not interfere with our purpose of illustrating the description of individuals that usually share the royal bounty. We shall proceed with our task, by briefly enumerating the remaining charges on the civil list.

The first is the salaries of the foreign ministers and their secretaries, and the charges of the different consuls abroad. The expense for the out-fit, and service of plate to these gentlemen, is also very considerable; but these, together with presents in *snuff-boxes*, charges for royal yachts, and sundry other outgoings, appear under the head of civil-list-contingencies, and do not form a part of the ordinary charges. Part of the salaries of the lord chancellor and the judges are paid out of the civil list; also the salaries of the lords of the treasury and chancellor of the exchequer. The incomes of the royal dukes and princesses were formerly payable out of the civil list; but, with the exception of some inconsiderable annuities, they are now transferred to the consolidated fund.

There are various miscellaneous charges on the civil list; some of them of great antiquity, consisting of allowances to the universities, to colleges, schools, individuals, and corporations; these, as well as an estimate of the more ponderous charges we have enumerated, will be best brought together in one statement, divided into six classes, as they were submitted to parliament on the 3d of May, 1816, previous to the civil list regulation-bill of that year.

First Class.

Lord Chancellor	£5,000
Speaker of the House of Commons	1,825
Judges of the Court of King's Bench	8,500
Ditto of the Common Pleas	7,500
Barons of the Exchequer	6,500
Chief and Second Justices of Chester	1,230
Justices of the Court of Great Session in Wales	2,400
Total....	£32,955

Second Class.

Bills of his Majesty's tradesmen in the departments of the Lord Steward	£85,000
Ditto Lord Chamberlain	40,000
Ditto Master of the Horse	40,000
Ditto Master of the Robes	4,000
Ditto Surveyor-General of Works	40,000
Total....	<u>£209,000</u>

Third Class.

Lord Steward's salary, paid at the Exchequer	£1,540	0	0
Salaries, compensations, &c. payable in the Lord Steward's department	40,326	10	0
Lord Chamberlain's salary	3,000	0	0
Vice-Chamberlain's salary	600	0	0
Groom of the Stole	2,000	0	0
Twelve Gentlemen of the Bedchamber	12,000	0	0
Thirteen Grooms	6,500	0	0
Apothecary to his Majesty	115	0	0
Ditto to the Household	53	6	8
Salaries, compensations, &c. payable in Lord Chamberlain's department	34,793	14	0
	59,062	0	8
Salaries, compensations, and superannuation allowances, payable in the department of the Master of the Horse	27,743	0	0
Salaries payable in the department of the Master of the Robes ..	1,080	0	0
Salaries, compensations, and superannuation allowances, payable in the department of the Surveyor-General of Works	10,946	6	3
Total....	<u>£140,697</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>

Fourth Class.

Lord President of the Council	£4,000	0	0
First Clerk of the Council	250	0	0
One Clerk of the Council	100	0	0
Keeper of the Council-Chamber	36	10	0
— at 2s. 6d. per day	45	12	6
Lord Privy Seal	3,000	0	0
Constable of Dover Castle	4,100	0	0
Governor of Windsor Castle	182	10	0
Master of the Hawks	1,372	10	0
Chief Justice in Eyre, North of Trent	2,250	0	0
— South of Trent	2,316	13	4
Chancellor of the Garter	570	5	0
University of Oxford, for a Preacher, on a perpetuity	10	0	0
— Professor of Divinity	13	6	8
— Law	40	0	0
— Physic	40	0	0
— History	400	0	0
— Botany	200	0	0

University of Cambridge, on a perpetuity	£10	0	0
for a Preacher	10	0	0
Professor of Divinity	13	6	8
Law	40	0	0
Physic	40	0	0
History	400	0	0
Botany	200	0	0
Emanuel College, Cambridge	16	13	4
Dean and Chapter of Lichfield	10	0	0
Vicar of Lichfield	15	0	0
Master of the Temple	37	6	8
Reader at Hampton-Court Chapel	40	0	0
Fellows of Eton College, perpetuity	42	0	0
Dean and Chapter of Westminster, for French Minister, Savoy ..	60	0	0
Minister, Isle of Man	100	0	0
Bishop of Chester, for four Preachers	200	0	0
Vicar of the Tower	6	13	4
Minister of St. Botolph, Aldgate	7	0	0
Churchwardens of St. John the Baptist, for relief of the poor....	7	13	4
St. Michael, Cornhill, ditto, perpetuity	12	4	9
St. Magnus, ditto, ditto ..	21	4	8
Schoolmaster at Southwell, ditto	10	0	0
Corporation of Dartmouth	40	0	0
Mayor of Macclesfield	50	0	0
Corporation of Lyme Regis	100	0	0
for repairing the pier	100	0	0
Corporation of Berwick, for repairing the bridge	100	0	0
Christ's Hospital	370	10	0
Representatives of Sir John Hynde Cotton, perpetuity	5	6	8
Heirs of Colonel Fairfax	100	0	0
Nicholas Yates	100	0	0
Astronomer Royal	420	0	0
Housekeeper at Westminster	9	2	6
Keeper of the Lions in the Tower, including <i>extra allowance</i> for the animals	450	0	0
Knight Harbinger	195	16	8
Latin Secretary	280	0	0
Examiner of Plays	400	0	0
Gentleman-Usher of the Black Rod	200	0	0
Master of the Mechanics	150	0	0
Engraver of Seals	50	0	0
Keeper of the Tennis Court	132	3	4
Marshal of the Ceremonies	100	0	0
Assistant Master of ditto	121	13	4
Master of the Ceremonies	200	0	0
Ditto in lieu of bills	100	0	0
Genealogist of the Order of the Bath	100	0	0
Bath King at Arms	90	0	0
Secretary to the Order of the Bath	90	0	0
Register to ditto	90	0	0
Gentleman-Usher to ditto	90	0	0
Messenger to ditto	40	0	0
Four Pursuivants at Arms	80	0	0
Eight Heralds, at £26 : 13 : 4 each	213	6	8
Three Kings at Arms	120	0	0
Garter King at Arms	100	0	0
Gentleman Harbinger	70	0	0
Forty Gentlemen Pensioners, £100 each	4,000	0	0
Clerk of the Check	120	0	0
Standard Bearer to Gentlemen Pensioners	310	0	0
Captain of ditto	1,000	0	0

Keeper of Records at the Tower	£1,435	16	0
Keeper of the Council Records.....	500	0	0
Keeper of the Records at Whitehall.....	160	0	0
Keeper of the Records of Forfeited Estates	200	0	0
State Paper Office	970	0	0
Keeper of Records Court of Exchequer	900	0	0
Cursitor Baron of the Court of Exchequer	263	6	8
Solicitor to the Court of Exchequer	150	0	0
Treasurer's Remembrancer.....	64	2	2
Two Secondaries	9	0	0
Second Secondary.....	26	13	4
Clerks	11	5	0
Foreign Apposer	40	0	0
Clerk of the Foreign Estreats	96	13	4
Clerk of the Nichills	20	0	0
Clerk of the Pleas	6	10	0
King's Remembrancer	55	17	4
Clerks in the Office of ditto	7	13	4
Secondaries in ditto.....	8	0	0
Eleven Masters in Chancery	1,100	0	0
Clerk of the Hanaper	2,000	0	0
Twenty King's Counsel, £40 per annum each	800	0	0
Attorney-General.....	81	6	8
Solicitor-General	70	0	0
King's Prime Sergeant.....	41	6	10
Ten Sergeants at Arms, at £100 : 7 : 6 each.....	1,003	15	0
King's Clerk in the Crown-Office.....	50	0	0
Clerk of Foreign Estreats, Common Pleas	20	0	0
Advocate-General	20	0	0
Pipe-Officers.....	171	15	10
Total.....	£41,297	10	1

Fifth Class.

Commissioners of the Treasury.....	6,000	0	0
First Commissioner of ditto	4,022	0	0
Chancellor of the Exchequer.....	1,800	0	0
Total.....	£13,822	0	0

Sixth Class.

Special service and royal bounty	10,000	0	0
Home secret service money	10,000	0	0
Lord Almoner for alms	1,119	0	0
Archbishop of York, for charities and Arabic professors	900	0	0
Chamberlain of London, for the poor of that city.....	1,000	0	0
Chelsea water-works, for supplying the Treasury	52	14	0
Fees, &c. on the receipt of the privy purse of his Majesty and of his Royal Highness the Regent.....	522	0	0
His Majesty's charity to female objects in distress	1,212	2	6
Chairman of the Westminster sessions, for dinners	214	3	0
Mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs of the city of London, for impost on wine	100	16	0
Total.....	£25,110	15	6

AVERAGE EXPENDITURE OF THE CIVIL LIST FOR SEVEN YEARS, TO THE 5TH OF JULY, 1811; AVERAGE EXPENDITURE FOR TWO YEARS AND THREE QUARTERS DURING THE REGENCY, TO THE 5TH OF JANUARY, 1815; ESTIMATE OF THE FUTURE CHARGE OF THE CIVIL LIST; AND ESTIMATE OF THE CHARGE OF WHICH THE CIVIL LIST WAS RELIEVED BY THE CIVIL LIST REGULATION-BILL OF 1816. [Abstract from Papers laid before Parliament, in 1816.]

	Average Annual Expenditure for seven Years to 5th July, 1811.		Average Annual Expenditure for Two Years and Three Quarters, to 5th January, 1815.		Future Estimated Expenditure, 3d May, 1816.		Future Estimate of Charge from which the Civil List was relieved by the Bill of 1816.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Pensions and allowances to the Royal Family.....	220,640	0 0	334,500	0 0	298,000	0 0	30,500	0 0
Allowances to the Lord Chancellor, Judges, &c.....	32,870	0 0	32,854	0 0	32,954	0 0		
Allowance to foreign ministers	82,060	0 0	115,872	0 0	226,950	0 0		
Pensions to ditto.....	52,700	0 0	56,056	0 0				
Bills of his Majesty's tradesmen	259,933	0 0	360,924	0 0	209,000	0 0	25,000	0 0
Salaries to the departments of the Lord Chamberlain, Lord Steward, Master of the Horse, Master of the Robes	102,237	0 0	111,630	0 0				
Salaries in the Lord Chamberlain's department and Office of Works	6,682	0 0	3,960	0 0	140,700	0 0		
Compensation and Superannuation allowances.....	10,100	0 0	11,644	0 0				
Pensions	86,391	0 0	87,160	0 0	95,000	0 0		
Salaries and allowances to sundry persons.....	48,710	0 0	46,464	0 0	41,300	0 0	3,268	0 0
Salaries to the Commissioners of the Treasury	13,310	0 0	13,452	0 0	13,822	0 0		
OCCASIONAL PAYMENTS.....	187,050	0 0	323,270	0 0	26,000	0 0	197,900	0 0
	£1,102,683	0 0	1,497,786	0 0	1,083,727	0 0	255,768	0 0

Having fully placed before the reader the ordinary charges on the civil list, we shall next show the sums granted by parliament or otherwise obtained to meet these various disbursements. The importance of the preceding documents, especially the last, will be seen shortly; the estimate of the future expenditure of the civil list, on the 3d of May, 1816, formed the basis of the extravagant grant in 1820, and continued till the death of George IV. The shameless profusion in the civil-list-department during the Regency and the last reign we shall speedily illustrate.

From the year 1804 to 1811, the average annual expenditure of the civil list amounted to £1,102,683. On the commencement of the Regency, this branch of expenditure increased enormously. From 1812 to 1816, the average annual expenditure of the civil list was £1,371,000, being an increase of £268,317 over the expenditure of George III. This augmentation arose chiefly from the profusion in the royal household; from the expense of furniture and tradesmen's bills; of upholsters, jewellers, glass and china manufacturers, builders, perfumers, embroiderers, tailors, and so on. The charge for upholstery, only for three quarters of a year, was £46,291; of linen-drapery, £64,000; silversmiths, £40,000; wardrobe, £72,000. To provide for these additional outgoings, Lord Castlereagh introduced the Civil-List-Regulation-Bill of 1816. By this Bill, no check is imposed on the profusion of the court; it only provides that various fluctuating and other charges, heretofore paid out of the civil list, should be transferred to the consolidated fund, or provided for by new grants from parliament: in other words, that the civil list should be *augmented to the amount of its increased expenditure*. By this arrangement, an additional burden was imposed on the public, amounting to £255,768, being the total of the charges of which the civil list was relieved.

Among the charges transferred from the civil list were £35,000, payable to the junior branches of the royal family, and which were to be paid out of the consolidated fund; and also salaries, to the amount of £3,268, to certain officers and persons. All the charges, for the outfit of ministers to foreign courts, or presents to foreign ministers, incidental expenses in the Treasury, deficiencies of fees to secretaries of state, and in the law department, amounting to £197,000, were to be provided for by new grants from parliament. Various charges for furniture and other articles, heretofore provided by the lord chamberlain for public offices; the expense of collars, badges, and mantles for the orders of the Garter, Bath, and Thistle; and all expenses for repairs of public offices and buildings at the Tower, Whitehall, and Westminster; for works in St. James's Park and private roads, estimated at £25,000, were to be provided for by new grants. The total deduction of charges being, as before stated, £255,768.

Now it is obvious that to the amount of these charges the income of the Crown was augmented, and that the scale of extravagant expenditure, in the first four years of the Regency, from 1812 to 1816, formed the basis on which the civil list of George IV. was provided. On the accession of the late king, in 1820, no alteration was proposed

in the Civil-List-Regulation-Bill of 1816 ; it past, as is observed by the writer of a ministerial pamphlet of the day, with " the entire approbation of *all parties* ; that is, "*all parties*," without inquiry or examination, concurred in making a permanent addition to the king's income of a QUARTER OF A MILLION over that enjoyed by his predecessor.

But to judge of the immense disproportion in the incomes of the two sovereigns, it is necessary to advert to the *alteration in the value of money*. The average expenditure of George III. from 1804 to 1811, was £1,102,683. The average price of wheat, from 1804 to 1811, inclusive, was 87s. 6d. per quarter. The average price of wheat, during the ten years of the last reign, from 1820 to 1830, was 58s. 4d. per quarter ; indicating a rise in the value of money, as measured by corn, of above 33 per cent. The price of labour, profits, tithes, rents, and interest, all fell in nearly the same proportion ; so that it would not be too much to reckon an income of £67 equivalent to an income of £100 in the period selected for comparison ; and, consequently, that the expenditure of George III. of £1,102,683, in a depreciated currency, was not more than an expenditure of £638,797 at the value of money during the last reign. Had, therefore, the civil list of George IV. been fixed at the same nominal amount as the civil list of George III. it would have been virtually 33 per cent. greater ; but, besides being fixed at nearly the same nominal amount as that of his predecessor, *one-fourth less was to pay out of it* ; so that the real addition to the income of George IV. was not less than FIFTY-EIGHT per cent. an arrangement, we are told, with the " entire approbation of all parties."

The extravagant nature of the last settlement of the civil list must be plain : we have compared it with the latest expenditure of George III. and, allowing for the alteration in the currency and the charges transferred to other funds, the difference was more than HALF A MILLION. George III. was by no means a *cheap sovereign* ; but, in considering his expenditure, it ought to be borne in mind that he was liable to many outgoings from which his successor was exempted. Of this nature, were a large family—sums expended in the improvement of Windsor-castle—the charge of furnishing and decorating the apartments in the palaces for the princesses—their removal to and from Windsor, estimated at £20,000—the journeys to Weymouth—and furnishing apartments in Kensington-palace for the Princess of Wales ; all which tended to swell the royal expenditure in the seven years selected for comparison.

We have dwelt particularly on the increase in the late king's income, because it is probable that, on the assembling of the new parliament, an attempt will be made to administer a sort of national *composing draught*, under the semblance of a considerable reduction in the civil-list-expenditure. The sacrifice of a *quarter of a million*, however, will not be enough ; the civil list, in 1804, was relieved of public charges to the amount of £82,000, and, in 1816, to the amount of £255,768, and it will not be sufficient to reduce the royal income only to the amount of these sums ; but a reduction ought to be made in

consequence of the altered value of money, and the altered circumstances of the country, which has rendered a system of economy to an unprecedented extent indispensable; and to which all the productive classes of the empire has long since been compelled to submit. The civil list was the proper place at which retrenchment ought to have commenced in the last reign; and, by the abolition of the pension list, and a reduction of salaries and outgoings in the household, and other economical arrangements, a saving of half a million might have been effected without a diminution of the dignity of the Crown below the standard of the latest period of the government of George III. The futility and injustice of nibbling at a few clerks and the subalterns of administration, while the great Leviathan of expense remained uncurtailed, was evident to every intelligent person. But the fact is, neither ministers nor their regular opponents had ever a sincere wish to retrench on a *grand scale*. For obvious reasons, the two aristocratical factions were loth to bring the real state of the civil list before the country; since it was by indulging the lavish expenditure of George IV. "the powers that be," and the powers that wished to be, sought to be gratified.

These are not *ordinary times*, and ordinary measures will not be adequate to meet them. It is the ardent wish of William IV. we believe, to meet the wishes of the people; and there is little doubt the king will readily assent to any diminution his ministers may propose in his own income. But this is not all: we have not heard, since the commencement of the new reign, there has been any *reduction in the royal establishments*. The same number of sumptuous tables are spread every day at Windsor-castle; the same number of costly attendants, equipages, and palaces are kept up; the household, and all its expensive outgoings and innumerable retainers, are still undiminished: the only reduction we have heard of is in the *stud* of the late king; and, doubtless, there will be a saving in the articles of tailors' bills, perfumery, or molu, satin ottomans, fishing tackle, &c.: and it is said the housemaids, in future, are not officially to wear *silk gowns*, which will certainly enable them to submit to an abatement in wages. But all these items will contribute little to the main purpose; and the king, by accepting a diminished income, will only deceive himself, and delude the country: in short, he will be *involved in debts*, which, like those of his predecessors, will have to be discharged by additional parliamentary grants,—so that the public will not be ultimately saved a penny.

In order to make the future civil list commensurate with the expenditure, it is indispensable the royal outgoings and establishments should be entirely remodelled. In the first place, the *court pension list* should be abolished, and all future grants from mere personal favour or service be paid out of the privy purse. Next, some of the palaces should be shut up, or let, with their appendant domains, to the grantees of the aristocracy; some of whom, by means of an infamous Corn Law, having rentals quite adequate to support them. Of what use, for example, to the king are the palaces of Kew or Hampton-court, unless as retreats for practices to which it is not

necessary more particularly to describe. In the third place, the outgoings and establishments of the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the master of the horse, and the master of the robes ought to be unsparingly cut down, and the salaries, especially of those functionaries, reduced. By some such reforms as these, William IV. would be enabled to make a reduced allowance square with his income, but not otherwise. The king has not, like his father, a large family to maintain—at least, a family entitled to regal state; and, in some respects, he is better off than a *bachelor*, since he has got, according to every body's report, an amiable and frugal queen, and, consequently, is not subject to those extortions to which *single* men, in the various avocations of life, are unavoidably exposed. Altogether, then, we hope that his Majesty will be both able and willing to discharge the duties of his high office cheaper than any member of his august family; though we do not flatter ourselves he can go through his functions on any thing like the terms proposed by some Scotchman, who has offered to discharge all the duties of the monarch for £300 a-year, and find good security for the performance!

When the civil list is under discussion, it is usual to observe statements in the treasury papers, shewing how small a proportion of the sum granted under this head is expended in the maintenance of the king and his household. These ductile scribes never inform their readers that the principal extraneous branches of expenditure were transferred to the consolidated fund in 1804 and 1816, and the amount subsequently granted is appropriated almost exclusively to the support of the royal person and dignity. The sums specially applied to these purposes may be classed under the following heads. First, his Majesty's privy purse. The sum set apart for this purpose, under Geo. III., was £60,000; his successor (there being no prince of Wales) received in addition the revenues of the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, amounting to £25,000 a year; besides £6,000, and often more, out of the hereditary revenues; in all, for the privy purse, or pocket-money, £91,000. To the king's privy purse may be added, the bills of his Majesty's tradesmen, the disbursements in the departments of the lord chamberlain, lord steward, master of the horse, and master of the robes, and the court pension list; making together the total *personal* charge of a king of England, on the scale of the last reign, as follows:

Privy purse	£91,000	0	0
Tradesmen's bills	209,000	0	0
Salaries, &c. in the lord steward's department.....	41,866	10	0
Ditto in the lord chamberlain's	59,062	0	8
Department of the master of the horse	27,743	0	0
Department of the master of the robes	1,080	0	0
Surveyor-general of works.....	10,946	6	3
Court pensions, limited by 22 Geo. III. c. 82	95,000	0	0

£535,697 16 11

With the exception of the first sum, the remainder are taken from the estimates of 1816, which are the latest submitted to parliament. The total exhibits the personal expense of the chief magistrate, without including the charge for diplomatic service, the salaries of the judges, or other extraneous outgoing. It is the cost of a *king*, upon which we shall make no reflections, institute no invidious comparisons with the United States, nor contrast the unmeaning ceremonies, the irksome etiquette, the costly pageantry of royalty, and the few vapid sentences dropped at the opening and closing of every session of parliament, with the simple dignity and utility of the presidential office, and the able annual exposé of the American president; neither shall we surmise, for a moment, whether the country would be better or worse, supposing we had no king at all; the expenditure applied to relieve public burthens, and the government carried on, both in name and reality, by the ministers of the Oligarchy.—“When we see,” says Rabelais, “the print of Garagantua, that has a mouth as large as an oven, and swallows at one meal twelve hundred pounds of bread, twenty oxen, a hundred sheep, six hundred fowls, fifteen hundred horses, two thousand quails, a thousand barrels of wine, six hundred peaches, five hundred pine-apples, &c. &c. who does not say—That is the mouth of a KING?”

The subject is far from being exhausted; and, indeed, it is not easy to give a clear view of the various branches of the royal expenditure. The civil list allowance, as settled on the late king, agreeably to the extravagant estimate of lord Castlereagh in 1816, was £1,057,000; more than half of which was expended as above, the remainder in salaries and allowances. In this expenditure is not included the annuity of £50,000 per annum to Prince Coburg, nor various pensions and grants to the royal family. Besides which is another gross item called civil list contingencies, of uncertain amount, consisting of charges for repairs of public buildings, presents to foreign ministers, and the expense of entertaining them; the outfit and charges of ambassadors and consuls, and the expenses of commissions of inquiry: all these sums form what may be properly called the civil list expenditure. In 1817, parliament voted £500,000 for civil list contingencies; in 1818, £700,000; in subsequent years £300,000; and in the last year this outgoing was reduced to £167,354. The whole expenditure in the departments, either now or formerly appertaining to the civil list, when this branch of the public service was last settled, may be thus classed, from the *Annual Finance Accounts* for the year ending 5th of January, 1821.

CIVIL LIST CONTINGENCIES.

163

Civil List of England and Ireland.....	£1,057,000
Pensions of the Royal Family	327,066
Pensions to Individuals payable out of the Consolidated Fund	168,781
Civil List Contingencies	347,898
His Majesty's Secret Service Money.....	53,347
Courts of Justice (England)	65,138
Salaries and Allowances	56,948
Pensions on Hereditary Revenue of Excise and Post-Office	27,700
Mint	13,800
Civil Government in Scotland (Pensions and Salaries).....	132,081
Permanent Charges in Ireland	381,504
Total.....	<u>£2,631,253</u>

A few of the items comprised in the Civil List Contingencies of the past year will sufficiently illustrate this branch of the public expenditure.

Sums expended under the Head of Civil List Contingencies in the year 1829. Parl. Paper, No. 127, Session 1830.

Lord Heytesbury, ambassador at the court of Russia; in reimbursement of the expenses incurred by him in his journey from London to the head quarters of his Imperial Majesty on the Danube, from thence to Odessa, and during a protracted stay in that city, besides <i>various incidental expenses</i> incurred whilst accompanying his Imperial Majesty in the field.....	£1,348
Ditto; for post-office charges at Odessa and at St. Petersburg, travelling expenses from Odessa to St. Petersburg, expense of putting the establishment of the embassy <i>into mourning</i> on the death of the Empress Mother, and allowances to the paid attaché and chancery messenger to the embassy, in the four quarters ended 30th September, 1829.....	1,305
Henry W. W. Wynn, envoy at the court of Denmark; for post-office charges and <i>expenses of illuminations</i> on the marriage of Prince Frederick and Princess Wilhelmina, in the three quarters ended 31st March, 1829	252
Lord Erskine, envoy at the court of Bavaria; for <i>post-office charges</i> , and in a journey performed by his lordship on his Majesty's service, in the six quarters ending 30th September, 1829.....	381
E. C. Disbrowe, envoy at the court of Stutgardt; in reimbursement of the expenses incurred by him in transporting from London to Stutgardt, <i>his baggage and effects</i>	272
George Bosanquet, chargé d'affaires at the court of Spain; for post-office charges, <i>expenses of two general illuminations</i> at Madrid, the actual expense incurred by him for the rent of the house for the British mission at Madrid beyond the allowance granted to him under that head, journeys performed by him on his Majesty's service, loss by exchange on his salary, expense attending his Catholic Majesty at Aranjuez, and in <i>repairing and painting the royal arms</i> affixed to the house of the British minister at Madrid, in the five quarters ended 30th September, 1829	1,585

The amount issued to reimburse his Majesty's ministers residing at foreign courts, the fees paid at the Treasury and Exchequer offices, on the receipt of their respective salaries, for the year and a half ended 5th July, 1829	£11,108
Robert Gordon, to provide for expense of outfit and equipage, as ambassador to the Ottoman Porte	2,125
Henry Unwin Addington, to provide for expense of outfit and equipage, as envoy at the court of Spain	2,500
Messrs. Rundell and Bridge, in discharge of their bill for gold snuff-boxes, &c. as presents from his Majesty to foreign ministers	4,554
The expense incurred for a diamond aigrette, furnished as a present from his Majesty to the Grand Signior	2,100
The amount expended for furniture, ironmongery, matting, papering, lamps, &c. for public offices in Whitehall and Westminster	2,798
Ditto, for colours for the Foot Guards	1,278
Ditto, for chapel plate and furniture for the governors of Tobago, Barbadoes, St. Lucia, Jamaica, Bermuda, and Grenada	1,670
Ditto, for furniture for his Majesty's yacht the Royal Sovereign	48
Ditto, for furniture for the Prince Regent	10
Ditto, for the attendance in the House of Lords of the gentleman usher of the black rod, and for repairing the crown and the black rod	126
Ditto, for robes, collar, plate, &c. for knights of the several orders, badge for marshal of the ceremonies, picture for his Majesty's ambassador at St. Petersburg, &c.	1,169
The charge for lighting St. James's Park with gas, in the year ended 25th December, 1827	835
The commission for inquiring into the state of the Cape of Good Hope, Ceylon, and Mauritius, on account of salary and contingent expenses	9,184
The commission for inquiring into and reporting upon the administration of criminal law in the West Indies, on account of salary and contingent expenses	3,427
The sub-commissioners of records and their assistants, in reward for the duty performed by them in methodizing the public records, under the orders of the commissioners on public records, as recommended by those commissioners	6,624
For the conveyance, in H. M. ship Aurora, of the Bishop of Barbadoes and suite, for the purpose of his lordship's visiting the southern part of his diocese	94
To defray the expense of house-rent for the Lord Bishop of Barbadoes, from the 28th January, 1828, to the 12th August, 1829	508
The amount paid for relief of certain distressed Spanish subjects residing in this country, wholly without the means of subsistence, who had been employed with the British army, or under British authorities in Spain, or who had otherwise rendered service to our military operations in that country	18,040
Amount issued to Sir Robert Chester, in lieu of the per centage which the master and assistant-master of the ceremonies formerly received upon presents made by his Majesty to foreign ministers, &c. in the year 1828	650
Amount issued to Mr. P. Grillon, being the balance due to him for the entertainment of her Majesty the Queen of Portugal and suite, at his hotel in Albemarle-street	611
Payment in Ireland to sundry persons, as of his Majesty's bounty, for the years 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, and 1829	2,386

The Civil List Act of the last reign is worthy of the profligate administration from which it proceeded. The principle of the regulation was to prevent *future arrear* in the royal expenditure; and this was

accomplished, *first*, by relieving the civil list of all public charges of an expensive and fluctuating amount; and, *secondly*, by granting to the king an allowance framed on the most extravagant scale of expenditure ever known in this country, and such as experience had shown to be adequate to his most lavish demands. By these precautions, and with the hereditary revenues always ready to meet any unexpected outgoing, it would have been wonderful had not the scheme realised the expectations of the projectors. Another feature in lord Castlereagh's bill was the appointment of an entire new officer under the name of *auditor* of the civil list. The latter regulation can excite no surprise; for it is mostly observed, in any attempts at reform and retrenchment, ministers generally contrive to keep up the same amount of patronage by some new creations. An instance of this was afforded in the consolidation of the revenue departments of England and Ireland, when a vice-treasurer and his deputy were appointed, with a salary of £3000 a-year, apparently for no other object than to keep up the influence of the Crown. Again, when the further granting of pensions from the Leeward-Islands-fund was prohibited, ministers set up the West-India church-establishment. The functions of the auditor of the civil list are to superintend the accounts of the lord chamberlain, lord steward, and master of the horse; but certainly these were the duties which ought to have been performed by the heads of these departments, and for which they receive their salaries. Were it probable the public would be better secured against profusion in the royal expenditure when confided to the watchful vigilance of a commoner than when confided to three peers of the realm? The precaution was futile; but answered the purpose of a pretext for dipping into the pockets of the people. Mr. Herries was the first auditor appointed; his previous office, commissary-in-chief, had been abolished, and, we presume, ministers were at a loss how otherwise to dispose of him.

EXPENDITURE AND ROYAL DEBTS DURING THE LATE REIGNS.

The state of the civil list has varied so much during the reigns of George III. and IV., that it may be useful to give a brief sketch of the total amount of public money applied to the support of this department of expenditure, and in extricating the Crown and the members of the royal family from pecuniary embarrassments.

At the commencement of the reign of George III. the king accepted the fixed sum of £800,000 per annum in lieu of the hereditary, temporary, and other revenues. This sum was successively augmented by parliament as follows:

1 Geo. III. c. 1	£800,000
17 Geo. III. c. 21	100,000
44 Geo. III. c. 80	60,000
52 Geo. III. c. 6	70,000

Surplus of exchequer fees, applied by 23 Geo. III. c. 82 ..	£50,000
Surplus of Scotch revenues, applied by 50 Geo. III. c. 87..	10,000

In 1804, when £60,000 was added, the civil list was relieved of annual charges to the amount of £82,000. The debts of the king, paid by parliament, were as follows :

In 1769	£513,511
1777	618,340
1784	60,000
1786	210,000
1802	990,000
1804	591,842
1805	10,458
1814	118,857
	<hr/>
	£3,113,061
	<hr/>

Parliament granted, towards the extraordinary expenses of 1814, £100,000, making £3,213,061; and in January, 1815, there was a further debt on the civil list to the amount of £421,355. To these grants to the king must be added the monies granted to the royal family, and to defray those charges of which the civil list had been relieved, amounting to £9,561,396.* Besides which there was applied, either in aid of the civil list, or to liquidate arrears thereon, £1,653,717 out of the hereditary revenues.† So far brings the royal expenditure to January, 1815. In the following year the civil list expenditure amounted to £1,480,000; making the total expenditure, from the accession of George III. to January, 1816, £64,740,032.

This brings us down to the period when there was a general parliamentary investigation of the civil list; and when it was settled on the basis on which it continued, without material alteration, till the recent demise of the Crown. As we have before explained the nature of lord Castlereagh's settlement, (p. 162,) and the vast augmentation the civil list received, we shall not repeat our statement, further than by recapitulating the chief provisions.

In 1816 the civil list was relieved of public charges to the amount of £255,768, and the future provision for it was fixed at the sum of £1,083,729. £100,000 more was granted for the support of the establishment of George III. at Windsor-castle, and £10,000 per annum to Queen Charlotte, afterwards continued to the Duke of York, for superintendence. In the same year £60,000 was voted for the establishment of the Princess Charlotte and Prince Coburg. With the exception of the saving of £10,000, by the premature death of the Princess of Wales, in 1817, all these arrangements continued until the

* Parl. Report on the Civil List, Session 1815.—Ordered to be reprinted July 6, 1830.

† Ibid. p. 5.

accession of George IV. in 1820, when the civil list was fixed at £1,057,000, and so continued to the end of that monarch's reign.

Having obtained the ordinary charges of the civil list, we next inquire, what extraordinary aids flowed into this insatiable gulph. Like his predecessor, George IV. was constantly receiving, in addition to his regular income, *refreshers* out of the Admiralty droits, Gibraltar duties, and other branches of the hereditary revenues, either in aid of the privy purse, to defray travelling expenses among his lieges, or to meet extra-outgoings in the household. Besides these, items ordinarily inserted in that annual budget of miscellanies, the *civil contingencies* ought in justice to be placed to the account of the sovereign. Then, again, what masses of money have been swamped in the royal palaces. Upwards of £500,000 has been already granted for the repair and improvement of the Pimlico residence. On Windsor-castle the sum actually expended up to last January, amounted to £527,500;* and further estimates were submitted to parliament, to the amount of £488,000,† as necessary to finish this gothic barbarism. It is said, that the pavilion at Brighton has cost a million of money; and on the *cottage* in the Great Park half a million has been expended. For these facts we have no official authority, but they are traits of extravagance not improbable in a king who, in one year, spent £5,000, and more, in the single article of *robes*; whose stud of horses, though he seldom journeyed beyond the limits of his own pleasure grounds, was upwards of 200; and, whose *old clothes*, after his death, actually sold in the *heap* for £15,000! Such are the blessings conferred by a monarch of taste, who, through the agency of servile ministers and a patient people, obtained ample means to gratify his most fantastic desires.

Nothing has been yet said of the burthen imposed by the younger branches of the Royal Family. The pensions of these are paid out of the consolidated fund, and form a distinct charge from the civil list. The amounts payable at the time of the late demise, exclusive of official emoluments, were as follow:

Prince Leopold	£50,000
Duke of Clarence	32,500
Duke of Sussex	21,000
Duke of Cumberland	21,000
Duke of Cambridge	27,000
Duke of Gloucester	14,000
Prince George of Cumberland	6,000
Princess Augusta	13,000
Princess Mary	13,000
Princess Elizabeth	13,000
Princess Sophia	13,000
Duchess of Clarence	6,000
Duchess of Kent	12,000
Princess Sophia of Gloucester	7,000

Every change in the personal relations of the royal family entails additional expense on the community, whether it be a marriage, a

* Parl. Report, No. 656, Session 1830.

† Ibid. pp. 2, 3.

christening, or a burial. In the first case, there is a grant for an *outfit*; in the second, a grant for *support and education*; and in the last, a provision for the servants of the deceased. The public is now paying upwards of £30,000 per annum for the servants of George III., Queen Charlotte, and Queen Caroline.* In 1825 an annuity of £6,000 a-year was granted to the Duke of Cumberland, to *support and educate* his son, Prince George-Frederick-Alexander-Charles-Ernest-Augustus of Cumberland, (gracious heaven, what a long name this child has got!) and in the same year a like annuity to the Duchess of Kent, for Alexandrina-Victoria. One might suppose these high personages had never been married, and the fact of having offspring was among the accidents of life for which they were totally unprovided.

People naturally wonder what become of the heaps of money abstracted from them in taxes; they are, in fact, only imperfectly acquainted with the costliness of the institutions under which they live, and the profusion with which the produce of their industry and skill is lavished. We shall, however, endeavour to open their eyes on these subjects. Let us see, then, what has been the total cost of the two last reigns; after the preceding explanations the reader will be better able to comprehend and verify the subjoined recapitulation.

Summary of the Royal Expenditure, from the Accession of George III. to the Death of George IV.

From the accession of George III. to January 5, 1815, the income of the civil list, and parliamentary grants to liquidate debts thereon	£51,623,564	
Parliamentary grants to the royal family, and for judges and other services, of the charge for which the civil list was relieved	9,561,390	
Monies applied out of the hereditary revenues	1,653,717	
Debts on the civil list, January 1815	421,355	
Civil list expenditure for the year ending January 5, 1816	1,480,000	
Royal expenditure from the accession of George III. to the year 1816		64,740,026
From 1816 to 1820, the income of civil list by 56 Geo. III. c. 46	4,334,916	
Windsor-castle establishment, including allowance for <i>custos</i>	440,000	
Parliamentary grants for pensions, salaries, and ser- vices, of which the civil list was relieved	1,358,072	
Pensions and official salaries of the royal dukes and princesses, including Prince Cöburg and Queen Caroline	1,335,344	
Monies applied in aid of the king and royal family from the hereditary revenues	350,000	
Revenues of the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster ..	100,000	
Allowance to Queen Charlotte to her death in 1818 ..	116,000	
Royal expenditure, from 1816 to 1820		8,034,332
Carried forward		£72,774,358

* Annual Finance Accounts, Session 1830, p. 134.

	Brought forward.....	£72,774,358
From 1820 to 1830, the income of the civil list, by 1 Geo. IV. c. 1.....	10,570,000	
Parliamentary grants for pensions, salaries, and ser- vices, of which the civil list was relieved	3,397,680	
Pensions, salaries, and allowances of the royal dukes and princesses, including Prince Coburg	3,575,000	
Monies appropriated to the use of the king and royal dukes, out of Admiralty droits and Gibraltar duties	150,000	
Revenues of the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster, paid into the privy purse	250,000	
Allowances to the late servants of George III., Queen Charlotte, and Queen Caroline.....	350,000	
Expense of repairing and improving Buckingham-pa- lace, to 1830	496,269	
Grants for the alteration and improvement of Windsor- castle, to January 5, 1830.....	527,500	
Royal expenditure, from 1820 to 1830.....		19,316,449
Grand Total of the royal expenditure, from the ac- cession of George III. to the death of George IV.....		£92,090,807

The salaries and official emoluments of the royal dukes, from first entering into public life to the year 1815, are not included; and there are various fees and perquisites of which they were in the receipt, and annuities to the princesses on the Irish civil list, of which we have not been able to obtain authentic returns. The total amount of the incomes of the king and royal family, for the last seventy years, cannot have been less than £100,000,000 sterling, making the average expenditure of a single family £1,428,571 per annum.

The people of England have been so long familiarized to the lavish expenditure of their rulers, that we fear they are unable to appreciate the importance of ONE HUNDRED MILLIONS of money. The best way to bring the mind rightly to estimate the magnitude of this sum, is, to reflect for a moment on the amount of evil it might have averted, or the good it might have accomplished, had it been judiciously appropriated to the attainment of objects of national utility. An annual revenue of £1,428,571 is equal to one-third of all the sums levied in poor-rates during the two reigns, and would maintain two millions of poor people. By the saving of such a sum how many trumpery taxes might have been repealed, which harass and impede the industrious citizen! What a fund it would form to mitigate the sufferings constantly recurring from changes in the seasons and the vicissitudes of commerce! It is calculated that the annual application of a quarter of a million would enable to emigrate the whole of the redundant industry yearly accumulating from the progress of population. How much more, then, might be effected by the application of £1,428,571 per annum. What an impulse it would give to our mercantile navy, by creating employment for shipping in the conveyance of settlers:—what stores—what implements of agriculture, and other necessities, it

would furnish to families! Internal industry would be stimulated; new communities founded; the waste and desolate parts of the earth reclaimed and peopled; and by opening new channels of employment and demand, some of the evils, which most embitter our social state, alleviated.

A republican, perhaps, would contend that nearly the whole of the hundred millions might have been saved to the community, and point to the people of the United States of America for an example of frugal government. Their king only costs five thousand a year, instead of a million; and their other functionaries are equally cheap and reasonable. As for lords of the bed-chamber, grooms of the stole, master of the hawks, master of the robes, and other masters and lords, they have none of these things. And where is the loss they have sustained? Their government never appeared deficient in dignity or efficiency at home or abroad; and the duties of the executive magistracy have been discharged quite as well as in this country.

There is much truth in this; but the British people seem to have a taste for monarchy, and it is a point now hardly disputed, that every community has a right to choose its own form of government. It is true our chief magistrate is not the most efficient of public servants; neither fighting the battles of the country, conducting its negotiations, nor personally exercising judicial administration. Still, we do not consider him quite so useless in his station as "the gilded globe on the dome of St. Paul's," to which the capital "of the Corinthian column" has been rather absurdly compared. Every society must have a head—a king, president, or dictator; and, in fixing the amount of his revenue, it is necessary to have regard to the state and income of his subjects. A richly endowed church and aristocracy demand a richly endowed king *to match*: simultaneously with the curtailment of the income of the monarch ought the revenues of the priesthood and nobility to be curtailed, by the abolition of tithes, the repeal of corn-laws, and a more equal partition of national burthens.

The superior income of the sovereign, however, does not comprise all the advantages he enjoys over his lieges. The king pays no house-rent nor taxes; and if he travels he pays no turnpikes. If he marries there is an outfit; if he has a child there is a portion; and if he dies, he is buried at the public charge. What then, it may be asked, does the king pay? on what objects are his immense revenues disbursed? Here is a mystery. The fact seems to be, that the functions of the regal office have degenerated into etiquette; and the exalted individuals who discharge them have become, as one of the number observed, little more than a *ceremony*, whose duties are nominal, and whose outgoings—great though they be—consist only of trappings, attendance, and pageantry.

In what, for example, consist the duties of a king of the old European fashion?—At first sight they appear great and manifold: he holds courts and levees—opens and prorogues parliament—chooses ministers of state—

examines and signs all public grants and documents. These functions appear quite sufficient to occupy the attention of one individual; but if we examine them more closely, we shall find they are vain, shadowy, and unimportant.

What, for instance, is a court?—A pageant, a farce, in which a train of useless officers, gaudily attired, assemble, and those who have obtained an appointment, a pension, or place, express their gratitude by kissing the royal hands!

What is a levee?—A larger muster, a presentation of titled mendicants, and others, who move in procession before the king: they bow, and he bows, and sometimes smiles; they pass on, another and another, as “great a fool as t’ other;”—and this is a levee.

How does the king authenticate public documents? He writes W. R., or W. REX, at the top or bottom of a piece of parchment, vellum, or paper: this was done by a *machine* in the last reign, and many were in hopes that it would have been retained, and a similar contrivance extended to other regal functions, by which the monarch would have been able to retire on half-pay, or with a superannuation allowance.

What is the opening of parliament?—The king going in great state to the house of peers; reading about a dozen lines prepared for him by his ministers, containing nothing either rich or rare, and then returning in the same state.

What is a prorogation?—Much the same as last; with this difference, that the rogues are sent to kill partridges, instead of being called together to talk, and talk, and nothing but talk.

How does the king choose his ministers? He does not choose them at all: they are chosen by a majority of the parliament, which is chosen by one hundred and fifty-four individuals called boroughmongers, who have been chosen by God knows whom, but who appear a visitation inflicted on the people as a punishment for apathy and gullibility.

Are not kings the fathers of their people?—They are so called, but they are very unlike fathers, since, instead of feeding and protecting their children, their children feed and protect them.

Kings are called the sovereigns of their respective states?—They are so styled, certainly, but this is another fiction of feudality and priestcraft. The sovereignty is in the people; and, as every day affords experimental proof of the truth of the position, there are now few to call it in question.

Such is a catechism of the duties and attributes of what may be denominated feudal kings: as to *citizen kings*, they are a different creation, to which no one can reasonably object; being cheaply maintained, and having grave and important functions to discharge under the guarantee of a real responsibility to the source of their power. Mere theatrical royalty becoming hourly more unfashionable in Europe, it is probable it will soon be superseded by more useful and substantial realities.

POLICY AND CHARACTER OF THE TWO LATE REIGNS.

Having dwelt so long on the pecuniary affairs of the late reigns, our readers will, perhaps, have patience with us while we submit a few strictures on their political and social bearing.

The personal character of George III., and the predominant maxims of his reign, are too well known to require elucidation in this place; but one part of his policy has either not obtained the attention it deserves, or is not so generally understood. It is thought this prince, like his predecessor, was held in thralldom by the Boroughmongers: this is an error. Although the intellectual endowments of the king were not of a high order, he is entitled to the praise of being the first of his race who, if he did not emancipate himself from, at least lightened the yoke imposed on the executive by the Aristocracy.

The great families who had mainly contributed to the Revolution of 1688 claimed, for their services, an exclusive right to the government of the kingdom; having averted the despotism of the Stuarts, they sought to establish a despotism in themselves, and transmit the *divine right* of power, wrested from the monarch, to their own posterity. Parliamentary reform had not been agitated; and the people being of little political importance, the sovereign was the only obstacle to this oligarchical pretension. Hence their intrigues and encroachments were exclusively directed against the Crown. They sought to render the regal office a mere name; the king a puppet, to be moved by wires, of which they held the strings, to be brought out, like the unfortunate Montezuma, on *show days*, decked out in the habiliments of royalty, to inspire the multitude with respect for authority. William III. groaned under this system; Queen Ann patronized its opponents; the first and second George, having little knowledge of our institutions, and by nature not much qualified for the exercise of authority, submitted to it quietly; but, to the credit of George III., he openly rebelled against aristocratic usurpation. The king perceived, and his mother, the princess-dowager, in concert with lord Bute, demonstrated to him the galling bondage in which his predecessors had been held by the arrogance of the Devonshire, the Pelham, the Portland, and other towering families. "George," said the princess, "be KING;" and the prince obeyed her constant exhortation, and became so, not only in name but reality. The design was laudable, and even constitutional;—the king his prerogatives, and the people their representatives, being the whole creed of reformers. But it was only the first, not the second, the king regarded; while grasping at the prerogatives of the Stuarts, he was equally averse to the rights of the Commons.

Lord Bute was appointed the first minister on the new system. Being a man of little capacity, ignorant of public affairs, and the management of parties, he was compelled to retire. But the king did not abandon his object. Partly by the untractableness of his own character, partly by the adroitness with which he played the factions against each other, but most of all from the immense increase in the power of the Crown,

from taxation, the augmentation of the peerage, the establishment of the banking interest—aided with the money-jobbers, contractors, and speculators, he succeeded in breaking the aristocratical yoke. His independence may be dated from the American war. That contest was purely his own. It is even said he first suggested the stamp-duty. So much, however, was it considered the king's *personal quarrel*, that those who did not concur in it were branded as *disloyal*.

The last attempt of the Aristocracy to reduce the king to a state of pupillage was made in 1783, by the famous India Bill of Mr. Fox. This great measure, framed by Mr. Burke, was intended to establish a counterpoise to the influence of the Crown, by vesting the patronage of India in fifteen individuals, chosen by parliament; in other words, by the coalition administration. Nothing could have been devised more effectual for the purpose; for it would have placed the sovereign of England at the mercy of the sovereigns of Bengal, and erected a mound from which the palace of St. James's might always be maintained in dutiful and respectful obedience. But the king penetrated the snare that was laid for him; and, by a vigorous exertion of court influence and the artful excitement of popular clamour, the bill was thrown out, and the Whigs, driven from power in disgrace, sunk into complete insignificance. Their union with lord North exposed to the country the profligacy and rottenness of their public principles. It was the death-blow to party. "From the moment," says the bishop of Llandaff, "the coalition was formed betwixt lord North and the men who for many years had reprobated in the strongest terms his political principles, I lost all confidence in *public men*. I clearly saw that they sacrificed their public principles to private pique, and their honour to their ambition." The observations of Sir N. Wraxall are to the same purport. Mr. Nicholls, in his "Recollections," says, "from the death of lord Rockingham they became a *faction*, and their efforts were no longer employed for the attainment of any great public object." These writers speak from contemporary impression, and, consequently, represent the general feeling excited by their conduct.

The subsequent history of this party is too fresh in public recollection to require illustration. There are some Whigs yet, as there are some Jacobites, Bourbonites, and Johannites; for sects and parties hardly ever become extinct, however absurd their dogmas. But upon the whole, both Whiggism and Toryism may be considered defunct superstitions; and the impostures having been unmasked, men are now only shocked at the grossness of the idolatry by which they had been so long enslaved.

Upon the conduct of the Whigs, in their endeavours to control the executive, one or two observations may be made. That the influence of the Crown, after its enormous augmentation during the American war, required abridgment, there can be no question; but the means employed for this purpose were highly objectionable. The Whigs attempted to throw the weight into the wrong scale; they saw the preponderance of the Crown, but were insensible or indifferent to the humiliation of the People: they looked only to themselves, and instead

of raising the popular branch of the constitution, sought only their own aggrandizement, and, by providing sinecures and places for their adherents, balancing the patronage of the Crown. Hence the real friends of the people viewed their policy, not only with contempt, but abhorrence; for it contained no invitation to popular support—no guarantee for public liberty, and was merely the selfishness of party struggling for the influence and emoluments of regality.

Yet the Whigs complain of *ingratitude*, of the people being *deluded* from their "*Natural Leaders!*" But is not this a faithful history of their conduct? Is it not notorious, from the Revolution to the present time, the people have had no alternative, save despotism in the sovereign, or despotism in an oligarchy? Is it surprising that they revolted from both these propositions; that they repulsed with equal scorn the open partizans of absolute power, and those who, under hollow and hypocritical professions, sought to inveigle them out of their liberties, or render them the passive instruments of personal ambition? From such "*natural leaders,*" it was time the people separated, and established a party for themselves. That the secession was at length accomplished, may be ascribed to the efforts of sir Francis Burdett and the electors of Westminster, who were the first successfully to erect the standard of revolt from aristocratical domination.

Let us return to George III. The great theme of his panegyrists is his private virtues. For a king to discharge his duty to his people, it is not sufficient that he is neither passionately addicted to wine, nor women, nor gaming, and that he does not amuse himself occasionally, after the fashion of the East, by cutting off the heads of his lieges. Betwixt private men and those who fill important public stations there is a wide difference. The former may live and die as it has pleased Heaven to make them, and society has no right to complain, provided they observe the laws, and neither burthen the parish nor their friends. But the condition of a king is widely different: he has no privilege to be inept; he is the *retained* servant of the community, who has grave duties to discharge, and, his fees being enormous, it is not sufficient he is harmless and inoffensive, he ought to be actively beneficial. To judge of the blessings accruing from the reign of George III. it would be sufficient to contrast the state of the country when he ascended the throne with the condition to which it was reduced when his intellectual twilight subsided into total darkness. It is hardly possible to imagine how any career could have been more reckless, profligate, and regardless of ultimate consequences than that which entailed the paper currency, the monstrous debt, and poor-rates. Private virtues are a poor set-off against national calamities, especially if produced by inveterate obstinacy and error, as was unquestionably the case with the two great and ruinous wars—those against America and France—in which George III. was engaged. Although the mental endowments of the king were very moderate, and he possessed no strength or originality of mind to carry him beyond the notions of religion and politics impressed during his education, yet, like others of the same intellectual grade, he had a quick sense of whatever tended to interfere with his own interests. He fully

comprehended the effect likely to be operated on the *status* of his order by the French revolution. When that mighty movement began to manifest itself, he put (says Mr. Nicholls) Burke's incendiary publication into the hands of every one he met. He said to every courtier who approached him, "If a stop is not put to French principles there will not be a king left in Europe in a few years." In fact, he was the greatest alarmist in his dominions. Mr. Burke and the duke of Portland were only second and third to him. Mr. Pitt was averse to the war, but acquiesced rather than lose the premiership. In like manner the Grenville-Whig administration consented to abandon Catholic Emancipation, on the condition of royal service. But the renunciation was not sufficiently explicit to satisfy the jealous scruples of the king.

To conclude, George III. was not a *tool* of the boroughmongers, but a leading and active partner in the Oligarchy. He left the Crown to his successor in more complete sovereignty—more independent of aristocratic influence—disputed title—favouritism, or any other control, than it had been held since the Conquest. His reign (as Bishop Watson observes) "was the triumph of Toryism. The Whigs had power for a moment—they quarrelled amongst themselves, and thereby lost the king's confidence, lost the people's confidence, and lost their power for ever; or, to speak more philosophically, there was neither Whigism nor Toryism left; excess of riches and excess of taxes, combined with excess of luxury, had introduced universal *selfism*."*

As we consider the next reign nothing more than an elongation of that of George III.—the government being conducted on precisely the same principles and maxims—we shall be very brief in our notice of it.

George the Fourth always appeared to us nothing more than a *man of pleasure*, whom the accident of birth had made a king. His means of indulgence were ample, and he did not spare them. At first he affected

* Anecdotes of the Life of Bishop Watson, p.194. This work, with the *Memoirs of Sir N. Wrexall*, and the *Recollections of George III.* by Mr. Nicholls, comprise valuable materials for forming a true estimate of the public men and measures that distinguished the last century. They have, we believe, been either unnoticed or greatly misrepresented by the reviewers; but this is a point of no great consequence, since Truth is in her nature buoyant and insinuating, and must ultimately triumph over every disadvantage. The monopoly of the press, like every other monopoly opposed to the general welfare, is fast tending to a consummation. The *Memoirs of Lord Waldegrave* is another useful publication for illustrating the factious nature of the government from the Revolution, and the entire want of public principle in the men who directed it. It is impossible to help commiserating the situation of George the Second, surrounded by venal statesmen, not one of whom would render him the least service without first bargaining for a batch of places and pensions for his relatives and dependents. Even Chatham, with whose name it had been usual to associate better things, appears, from the noble author, to have been no better than his compeers, and ready at any time to sacrifice his public duty to his selfishness and ambition. These repeated disclosures must, at length, convince the most incredulous; and all classes allow that the government, for the last century and a half, has been the prey of mercenary adventurers, whose sole objects were to plunder the people and tyrannize over the king.

Whigism; but this might arise from his favourite companions in horse-racing, drinking, and intriguing being of that persuasion. Still he appears to have been one of the orthodox sort; for, like the party generally, he only adhered to his Whig principles while out of place, and became a Tory on his accession to power. But the politics of princes and poets are seldom worth investigating; whatever a King of England may profess, while heir-apparent, or whatever popular principles may be held by a Whig lord, while out of office, the only principles on which they can act, on the assumption of power, are those of *TORYISM*—that is corruption and intimidation; and this is no new discovery, since Mr. Pitt declared, almost fifty years ago, that no *honest man* could carry on the government without a reformed parliament.

In the choice of his ministers, as in other things, the king considered his personal ease. At the commencement of the Regency, a slight effort was made to bring into the administration his early friends; but, finding them fastidious, pragmatical, and disposed to meddle in his household establishment, the design was abandoned, and never again seriously resumed. Castlereagh, Canning, Huskisson, and Sidmouth were the most appropriate servants for a voluptuous monarch. These men held no principle that could interfere with his most lavish desires; their objects were limited to the enjoyment of power and its emoluments: how little they cared about the general weal may be instanced in the fact that, though they managed the affairs of the empire during a long period of profound peace, they never set about reforming the most glaring and admitted abuses in its public administration, not even endeavouring to reform the currency, economize the expenditure, reduce the debt, improve the laws, nor the commercial system, for even that originated in another quarter. Their object was only to carry on the government and enjoy the spoil, and this they were ready to do by the aid of any shallow and temporary expedient, no matter the ultimate loss and misery it might entail upon the country. There is one event connected with Mr. Canning deserving of notice, since it evinced both discernment and firmness of mind in the sovereign. When the poor drivelling statesmen, Eldon, Bathurst, and Melville—the Polignacs and Peyronnets of the cabinet—refused to act with Mr. Canning as First Lord of the Treasury, as much, we believe, from personal jealousy as aversion to his more liberal ideas, the king stood manfully and magnanimously by his minister; and it is due to some of the Whigs to say that they did not refuse their aid in the moment of peril. Mr. Canning was the best of his set, but not to be greatly admired for his patriotism: he was clever and accomplished, but a corruptionist: had he lived, he would not, we apprehend, have been long premier, and, before his death, he evinced symptoms that showed he would prove neither a very useful nor very profound statesman.

It is not our intention to enter into any personal history or delineation of George IV.; for, in truth, we have nothing to communicate on these points but what is known to all the world. He always appeared to us to afford a striking confirmation of *LAVATER*'s theory—his physiognomy

and conduct being in such admirable keeping. Some have imagined a resemblance between him and the Emperor Tiberius. Both disappointed the expectations formed of them previous to their accession to power. One lived secluded from the sight of his subjects at the island of Capri; the other at Windsor. Women, wine, and mere sensual indulgence formed their chief employment and amusement. Neither of them knew *how to forgive*, and were implacable in personal resentments. The prosecution, by the King, of the unfortunate CAROLINE, and all who supported her, was mean, ungenerous, and unrelenting. His love of dress and etiquette was coxcomical, and detracted from the regal dignity. His love of seclusion it is not difficult to explain: George IV. was a *spoiled child*, who, through life, had been accustomed only to do what ministered to his own gratification. In his latter days, neither his vanity nor desires were likely to be flattered by a frequent appearance in public; age had enfeebled his powers, and to mingle among the "high-born dames" of the aristocracy, to select an object to whom to cast the royal handkerchief, was not among his urgent necessities.

To conclude: "God is just in all his ways!" George IV. Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Huskisson are all gathered to their fathers, and will soon be forgotten. They lived for *themselves*, and the public will not cherish any lasting and grateful remembrance of their memories. The monarch expired on a *chaise percée*—what a death-bed for an "*exquisite!*" Lord Castlereagh perished by his own hands. Mr. Canning, after indulging in some unseasonable jokes on the infirmities of poor Ogden—of which no doubt he repented—died of internal inflammation. Mr. Huskisson's death was deplorable. But what ought we to learn from these catastrophes?—Neither to envy the great, nor refuse sympathy to the unfortunate!

CONCLUSION OF THE CROWN REVENUES AND CIVIL LIST.

We shall conclude our account of the hereditary revenues of the Crown and the Civil List, with a brief recapitulation of the chief points comprised in this and the preceding chapter.

1.—The crown lands, from the earliest period of the monarchy, have been improvidently managed, and the source of endless jobbing and abuse; and the sale of these national domains would not only cut off a dangerous source of ministerial influence, but render them more productive, and effect a saving in the public expenditure.

2.—There is a large mass of floating revenue, accruing from the droits of admiralty, from the four-and-a-half per cent. fund, the ancient income of Scotland, colonial duties, escheats in cases of illegitimacy, quit-rents in the colonies, and other sources, producing, in the two late reigns, fourteen millions of money, which is neither applied directly to defray the charges of the civil list, nor to any public object, but forms a fund at the irresponsible disposal of ministers.

3.—It is extremely difficult to say what funds are considered at mi-

nisterial disposal. The instance mentioned, page 141, of remitting the customs duty on sugar is an example of the power of a *Treasury Minute*, to raise contributions in case of emergency. The appropriation of the surplus of the *French claims* is another instance. In this case, a finance-committee ascertained that a sum of £250,000 had been, by a mere order of the treasury, paid over, without the consent of parliament, to the commissioners of woods and forests, by the commission for liquidating the claims of British subjects on the French government, and subsequently expended in the alterations at Buckingham House.*

4.—The immense income arising from the hereditary revenues, and other sources, and not appropriated by parliament, appears to have been chiefly expended by ministers in objects personal to themselves, the king, or royal family; in pensions and grants to their parliamentary supporters, their relatives and dependants; in the purchase of tithes and church patronage; in the building and pulling down of palaces; in payments into the privy purse; in defraying the expense of the king's household, and other outgoings, which ought to have been defrayed out of the civil list: in short, it appears that, for the last seventy years, the public has not only been burthened with an enormous provision for a civil list, but has failed to derive any advantage from those funds, in lieu of which a civil list was specially granted.

5.—The civil list granted to George IV. was to an unprecedented amount, and ought to have formed the first object of economical reduction.

6.—The civil list of the late reign was settled on the basis of the extravagant expenditure during the first years of the Regency; when, from profusion in the household, and other departments, the outgoings exceeded, by more than a *quarter of a million*, the outgoings in the seven last years of the government of George III.

7.—Allowing for the alteration in the value of money, and the transfer to other funds of charges heretofore paid out of the civil-list, the real income of George IV. exceeded that of his predecessor *fifty-eight* per cent.

8.—The total income of the royal family, for the last seventy years, has been at least £100,000,000, or £1,428,571 per annum.

9.—The civil list forms the first subject for reduction; and to reduce the salaries of the subaltern servants of government, while this charge continues, without the abatement of at least half a million per annum, is futile and unjust, and does not evince a sincere desire in ministers to relieve public distress by effectual retrenchment.

10.—The vote of the first session of the reign of George IV., which left the hereditary revenues at the irresponsible disposal of ministers, and without a vast reduction in the civil-list-allowance, on account of the alteration in the value of money, and the removal of charges to other funds, was the most improvident on record; and though it was such

* Mr. M. A. Taylor's motion in the House of Commons, June 23, 1828.

an one as might be expected from a body of men directly interested in the profusion they supported, still, we trust, such a pernicious precedent will not be followed on the approaching settlement of the civil-list of William IV.

Lastly.—The whole subject of the crown-revenues and civil-list calls loudly for revision and inquiry; no branch of the public expenditure presenting such a mass of incongruity, abuse, and profusion. There is nothing either simple, dignified, or economical, in the present arrangement. A civil list is voted by the house of commons; of which part is given to the king, as *pocket-money*, by his ministers, that is, his servants; part is expended in supporting the household; part in defraying the salaries of the lords of the treasury, and in paying a part of the salaries of the judges and speaker of the house of commons; then comes a list of trifling and absurd payments to the mayor of Macclesfield, to the corporation of Lyme Regis, for repairing the pier, to schoolmasters, seal-engravers, church-wardens, to the city of London for wine, to the Greenwich astronomer, to the keeper of the lions in the Tower, including *extra allowance for the animals*. Now, one might ask in what way is the king's dignity maintained by the civil-list being burthened with these absurd and incongruous payments? or, we might ask, where is the propriety of paying the salaries of the judges, and other public officers, partly from one fund and partly from another, some of them being paid from seven or eight different funds? Can this serve any object, except to mislead the public as to the real amount of their incomes, and keep up a system of collusion and abuse? Lastly, we might ask, where is the utility of the house of commons voting a fixed sum for the civil-list, or scrutinizing the different items of the royal expenditure, when, by another vote, it leaves immense funds, of uncertain amount, at the uncontrolled disposal of the Crown?

PRIVY COUNCIL, DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS,

AND

CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS.

A BRIEF notice of these subjects will appropriately follow our preceding exposition of the hereditary revenues and civil-list. In the salaries and emoluments enjoyed by the privy council, no less than in the dignity and *utility* of its functions, it may justly claim precedence next the Crown. The number of members of this august body is indefinite, and at the pleasure of the king; at present it is 169, comprising the royal dukes, the archbishops, the ministers, the chief officers in the royal household, the heads of the law-courts, and all the principal nobles and commoners who hold, or have held, the more important situations in the civil, military, and diplomatic service of the government. They sit during life, or the life of the king who nominates them, subject to removal at his majesty's discretion. They are bound by oath to advise the king, without partiality, affection, and dread; to keep his council secret, to avoid corruption, and to assist in the execution of what is there resolved. To assault, wound, or attempt to kill a privy counsellor, in the execution of his office, is felony.

Although the ostensible duties of the council are, to advise the king in affairs of state, yet this duty is seldom discharged; and a privy counsellor, as such, is as little the adviser of the sovereign as a peer of the realm, who is denominated the hereditary adviser of the Crown. The really efficient and responsible advisers of the king are the ministers, especially that portion of them constituting the cabinet. No privy counsellor attends in council, unless expressly summoned for the occasion; and summonses are never sent except to those counsellors who, as members of the administration, are in the immediate confidence of his majesty. The privy council, then, is an institution of state, without salaries and without duties; and, as such, would require no notice in this publication. Authors who amuse themselves and their readers in describing that "shadow of a shade," the English constitution, make a great parade of the grave functions and high privileges of "*his majesty's most honourable privy council*;" but practice is as widely dif-

ferent from theory, in respect of this, as in respect of the representative branch of the government.

Although the privy council *ex officio* is little more than a nonentity, yet, from extrinsic circumstances, it is a body of great interest, and some account of it is strictly relevant to our purpose. Nearly the whole of the privy counsellors do now, or have held important offices in the state; and, in consequence of these offices, have contrived to concentrate, in their own persons, a miscellany of pensions, salaries, sinecures, and grants, which is almost incredible. The mass of taxes consumed by George III. and IV. having been set forth, we may, as an appropriate sequel, set forth the mass of taxes still annually consumed by those "grave and reverend seigniors," who were fortunate enough to enjoy the greatest share of the favour and confidence of these monarchs.

Our task will be much abbreviated by the exposition of an honourable member last session of Parliament. In a committee of supply on the 14th of May, Sir JAMES GRAHAM moved "For a return of all salaries, profits, pay, fees, and emoluments, whether civil or military, from the 5th of January, 1829, to the 5th of January, 1830, held and enjoyed by each of his Majesty's most honorable Privy Council, specifying, with each name, the total amount received by each individual, and distinguishing the various sources from which the same is derived." After urging a variety of cogent arguments in support of the propriety and utility of his motion, Sir James made the following extraordinary statement, founded on documents in his possession, and which statement was not contradicted.

"He had divided the Privy Counsellors into classes, excepting from each the Royal Family, because they, having a certain income under the assignment of Acts of Parliament, there was nothing mysterious about them; and, in many cases, these assignments had been made under the sanction of bills, which had themselves undergone discussion in the House. He, therefore, excluded them altogether from his calculations upon this occasion. The total number of Privy Counsellors was 169, of whom 113 received public money. The whole sum distributed annually amongst these 113 was £650,164, and the average proportion of that sum paid to each yearly was £5,753. Of this total of £650,164, £86,103 were for *sinecures*, £442,411 for active services, and £121,650 for *pensions*, making together the total which he had stated. Of the 113 Privy Counsellors, who were thus receivers of the public money, thirty were *pluralists*, or persons holding more offices than one, whether as sinecurists or civil and military officers. The amount received by the pluralists was £221,133 annually amongst them all, or £7,331, upon an average, to each annually. The number of Privy Counsellors who enjoyed full or half pay, or were pensioned as diplomatists, was twenty-nine, and the gross amount of their income from the public purse was £126,175, or, upon an average, a yearly income to each individual of £4,347 a year. The whole number of Privy Counsellors who were members of both Houses of Parliament was sixty-nine, and of those forty-seven were PEERS, whose gross income from the public purse was £378,846, or, upon an average to

each, £8,060 a year. The remaining twenty-two were of the House of Commons, and the gross amount of their receipts was £90,849, or, upon an average to each individual, £4,128 a year. It appeared then that there were 113 Privy Counsellors receiving the public money, of whom sixty-nine were members of either house of Parliament. He had already stated that sixty-nine were in the receipt of public money by way of salary; the total number of Privy Counsellors in the House of Commons was thirty-one, and of these twenty-two were charged upon the public purse. In this analysis there might be some inaccuracy; but, if its accuracy were denied, his answer, short and conclusive, was—grant this motion, and prove the error to the public satisfaction.”

The motion was not granted; in lieu of it the chancellor of the Exchequer substituted and carried a motion, *of his own*, for a return of salaries and emoluments above £250, held by all persons in the civil departments of the United Kingdom. The honourable member had moved for the return of the public emoluments of 169 individuals, and Mr. Goulburn overwhelmed him with a return of 2000. It was serving him, as sir James remarked, when he called for a glass of wine, with a glass of wine diluted with a bottle of water.

In fact, it was a complete avoidance of the object sought by the member for Cumberland. Mr. Goulburn said it would be *invidious* to produce a return of the emoluments of the Privy Council alone. What! more invidious than to move for and obtain, as was the case in 1806, of a return of the pensions and emoluments of the royal Dukes! Or more invidious than to seek and obtain, as was the case in 1822, a return of the pensions and emoluments of the honourable members themselves! The king has often submitted to such invidious proceedings—his income and expenditure too—the amount of his tailors’ bills—his upholstery bills—the outgoings in his household—even down to the consumption of pickles and potatoes—have all been sifted and overhauled, oftener than once, and no one thought it invidious. Receiving annually a great mass of public money, which imposed a heavy burthen on the people, they had a right to look into his majesty’s affairs, just in the same way as they have a right to look into the affairs of these privy counsellors. But the chancellor of the Exchequer wished to screen the most honourables, by mixing them up with the clerks, and tidewaiters, and other subalterns, who serve not so much for present pay, as the hope of obtaining higher and more lucrative appointments. It was a dextrous diversion of the enemy’s attack, worthy of the sublime genius who framed the Irish Tithe Composition Act. Precisely the same manœuvre is resorted to by the apologists of the ecclesiastical establishment to conceal the enormous revenues of the clergy. They have a great repugnance to giving separate statements of the incomes of the bishops, the dignitaries, and aristocratic pluralists; they like to see them all *lumped together*, those with high connexion and influence, and those with none,—and then, after exaggerating their numbers two-fold, they call upon you to look and sympathize at the miserable pittance allotted to the sons of Mother Church! But this will

not do. It is not the *average* but the *disproportion* that shocks public feeling. A friendless incumbent or poor clerk cannot make his miserable stipend go a jot farther in the purchase of the necessaries of life, because there is some court bishop or court lord chancellor with thirty or forty thousand a year. What the community revolts at is the total burthen imposed by the whole number of spiritual and lay placemen, chiefly by the exorbitant emoluments of a few favoured individuals.

However, Mr. Goulburn's *ruse* in favour of these most honourable privy counsellors certainly shall not succeed. Sir J. Graham never published a list of these cormorants; it is an omission which we think, from the returns made last session, and other authentic documents in our possession, we shall be able to supply; and this we shall not fail to do, in a subsequent and more appropriate part of our publication.

AMBASSADORS AND DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS.

There is, we will venture to affirm, no branch of our multifarious civil services which requires to be more keenly investigated, and more unsparingly curtailed than our foreign embassies. Only think of a British ambassador at the court of France, independently of a splendid house, bought by the public money, having £12,100 a-year; Russia, £13,100; Austria, £13,100; Spain, £13,100; Netherlands, £13,000; Ottoman Porte, £10,464: and these exclusive of allowances for outfits, for presents, for the charge of journeys, for postage, for mourning-dresses, or any other casual outgoing. No other country makes such extravagant allowances to her ministers. Few native noblemen of any of the courts here enumerated are able to vie, in household expense, with men possessing such princely incomes; and it cannot be politic in England to place her representatives in a point of view so invidious towards the communities among which they sojourn. In fact, it is said that hints have, at various times, been transmitted to the government of this country upon the annoyance which is often felt abroad at the unequalled revenues allowed by Great Britain to her diplomatists at foreign courts, for the support of what she calls her *dignity*. Now, the best kind of national dignity is that which renders justice, and demands it—that which is upheld by the urbanity and knowledge of the public officers who represent their nation amongst foreigners; and, after the common decencies of respectable life have been furnished, little, if any thing, is gained, by mere extravagance and ostentation, to the interests or dignity of a great people. America allows her envoys and plenipotentiaries about £2000, and secretaries of legation £321 per annum; and her dignity and interests are adequately sustained and represented.

Nothing, indeed, can be plainer than if men of a high order of talents, but of private station in society, were to be selected for foreign missions, two good effects would follow. The national business would be incomparably better done, and the extravagance of the diplomatic service might be corrected without a murmur. It is far otherwise when men of *noble birth*, but mean capacity, make *love* to the appointment,

and are chosen : that is the secret of our £460,000 expenditure in diplomacy. The borough system is at the bottom of this abuse, as of every other ; and if the puppets of that system do not always succeed in shutting the doors of Parliament against popular representatives, it is certain that they keep the representation of the sovereign elsewhere very snugly and comfortably to themselves.

In the whole range of the public service, nothing accords so well with the taste and acquirements of the aristocracy as this vice-regal mimicry and ostentation. The chief qualifications of an ambassador are that he should be able to bow gracefully, be six feet high, of portly presence, and keep a good table for the entertainment of absentee lords and ladies ; as to real business, it is done by the secretaries : and if any thing extra occurs, there is a special mission for the purpose. Some of the most famous jobs in the history of corruption have been got up under the pretext of an embassy. Witness the mission of the late Mr. Canning to Lisbon. It is well known that the son of this gentleman was in a declining state of health, and required a milder atmosphere ; when the father was sent ambassador to Lisbon, where there was *actually no court*, at an expense to the country of eighteen thousand pounds. Again, in 1821, when a negotiation was on foot to bring the Grenvilles into the administration, one of the stipulations was that, a member of the family, Mr. Henry Wynn, should be sent on a mission to Switzerland, with a salary of £4,000, and this large allowance was justified on the pretext that it was necessary to enable the minister to maintain a liberal hospitality towards his countrymen abroad. And sure enough the hospitable disposition of this young gentlemen was soon called into exercise, for he had scarcely arrived at his destination before his brother, Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, Lady Harriet Williams Wynn, and eight more Wynns repaired to Berne, to share the hospitalities of the generous youth, provided out of the taxes of the people of England !

But even these jobs are nothing to the more recent ones that have been going on under the pretext of missions to South America, and to the particulars of which we shall introduce the reader from a parliamentary paper of last session (No. 318) and a speech of Sir James Graham.

As a sample of the enormous charge of these diplomatic missions, we shall first cite the Mexican embassy. In this year, 1825, Mr. Morier, received, for five months service as Mexican commissioner, £3,655 salary, and £1,670 expenses. In the next year, the same gentlemen received, for three months service, £3,594 ; making a total of £8,917 for eight months in two years. This, one would think, quite enough for the cost of one mission, but it was not so : Mr. Ward, the second commissioner, received a much larger remuneration for the same services, in the same year, in the same place. In 1825 this gentleman received £10,920 ; in 1826, £5,598 ; in 1827, £2,523, exclusive of £825 passage-money, making, with other items, a charge of not less than £19,808 for twenty-five months services of Mr. Ward alone. But even this did not include the entire cost—there was a secretary attached to the

mission. This gentleman was a Mr. Thompson, who charged £100 per month salary for his services, and actually, in addition, asked for compensation—for what? Why, for his salary *as clerk in the Audit Office* while he was absent on other duties. The same modest officer also charged £1,607 for the cost of a trip to Guatemala, which he fancied to take. This made an entire charge of £31,857 in two years for one mission to Mexico.

One object of Mr. Ward's mission, according to the explanation of the chancellor of the Exchequer, was to ascertain what the expense of these South American embassies might be; and it must be allowed that Mr. Ward went the right way to work to make them very comfortable appointments for his successors, by not fixing the standard at too meagre a scale; and if the gentlemen who succeed him can only get up a book beside, as their predecessor has done, they will be very productive excursions indeed.

The next mission deserving attention is that to Columbia. Our envoy there was Mr. Cockburn who, in 1825, received an outfit of £3,000. In 1826, he went to South America, landed at the Caraccas, and never advanced to Bogota: he remained three weeks, at the house of the consul, and then returned. For this excursion, he received a year's salary, £6,000; allowance for house rent, £600; expense of conveying him out, £450. Next year he started again for Bogota, never reached his destination, returned to London after an absence of seven months, to announce his own movements instead of transmitting despatches in the usual way, charging £3,376 for this trip. He thus crossed the Atlantic twice, at the public expense, without ever penetrating to the capital to which he was officially appointed; he was the first year three weeks in America, and the second nine weeks; and for his services altogether he received £13,000. It might be thought after this we had done with this gentleman, but something remains—he applied for farther remuneration, and actually received £1,664 to “complete his allowance,” and then this highly efficient envoy extraordinary rested from his labours on a pension of £1,700 a-year.

Next we come to Mr. Chad, who was recalled from Dresden, to proceed forthwith to Bogota. He got £1,666 for an outfit in the year 1828, together with £1,374; and in 1829, £2,062, although he never left London. Mr. Turner got, in 1829, £2,500 for this same mission, besides a large sum for house-rent, he never having been in Columbia at all; and £528 for his voyage out. In this manner, Mr. Cockburn received £15,000 for going out, but never entering the capital; Mr. Chad got £5002 for preparing to go out, but never going at all; and Mr. Turner, £4,955 for undertaking the voyage: whether this last gentleman has arrived at his destination, or absconded, or deviated into a more pleasant tour through Switzerland or Italy, does not appear. So much for the Columbian mission.

Next let us advert to the mission to Buenos Ayres. The first on the roll is Lord Ponsonby, who received an outfit of £2,500, salary £5,000, and an allowance for house-rent £500. These allowances are a

little extravagant, but his lordship, unlike the Chads and the Cockburns, did arrive at his post. We cannot say the same of his successor, Mr. Henry Fox, the near relation of a very distinguished statesman. Mr. Fox received an outfit of £1,500 for Buenos Ayres, in 1828, at the time he was in Italy, in the receipt of a salary; and, in 1829, an advance of £1,000, though it does not appear he has yet taken a step towards his American journey. There is similar profusion in the missions to Brazil and Panama, but the examples we have cited are sufficient specimens of the lavish proceedings in this branch of the foreign department. We shall conclude with the *bills of charges* for the Mexican and Colombian missions, transcribed from the Parliamentary Return to which we have alluded, and which will show that the aristocracy and their dependants are quite as dexterous in the manufacturing of these documents as any of the bourgeois, whom some of them affect to proscribe with such sovereign disdain.

Charges for Outfit, Salaries, Travelling Expenses, and other Outgoings by the Diplomatic Missions to Mexico and Columbia.
Parl. Paper, No. 318, Session 1830.

MEXICAN MISSION.

Expenses of housekeeping, stable, light and fire, for his Majesty's Commission in Mexico, from January to May 1825; 5 months	£2,932	15	6
Salaries and allowances to an interpreter, clerk, and physician to the Commission, and for compensation to Mr. MORIER, the chief commissioner, for suspended pension, from December 1824 to July 1825	592	1	4
Wages for half a year to July 1825, of servants to the Commission.....	132	0	0
Expenses of the Commission in couriers, including cabinet messenger, from December 1824 to May 1825.....	598	6	3
Expenses of the journey home of Mr. Morier and suite from Mexico to London, from May to July 1825	538	4	10
Expenses of Mr. Morier while employed in London on his Majesty's service, from July to October 1825.....	532	0	0
Expenses of the journey of Mr. Morier and suite from London to Mexico, from October 1825 to January 1826	769	3	10
Allowance to Dr. Mair, medical attendant on the Commission, for one quarter, from October 1825 to January 1826	75	0	0
Salary to Mr. THOMPSON, secretary to the Commission, for one year, from January 5, 1825 to January 5, 1826	500	0	0
Compensation for the loss of his salary, as clerk at the Audit Office, while employed at Mexico, from October 1824 to January 1826	380	0	0
Expenses of the journey of Mr. WARD, Chargé d'Affaires and secretary of legation, on his Majesty's service from London to Mexico, from January to March 1825.....	1,368	19	8
Expenses up to May 1825, including house-rent from January; Mr. Ward's servants and horses, and fête given on the birthday of his Majesty	1,540	0	0
Expenses on account of couriers, from March to May 1825	548	15	11
Stationery for his Majesty's service.....	36	12	2
Expenses of housekeeping, stable, light and fire, for his Majesty's Commission, from May 1825 to January 1826; 8 months	5,456	19	4

<i>Extra expenses of the Commission in couriers, journeys, illuminations, and subscriptions, from May 1825 to January 1826.....</i>	<i>£ 1,980 19 1</i>
For expenses of Mr. Thompson, in his journeys on his Majesty's special service from Mexico to Guatemala, in his residence at Guatemala, and his journey thence to London, from May to October 1825	1,607 17 7
Expenses of his Majesty's Commission in Mexico, from January to March 1826.....	1,506 3 1
Expenses of Mr. Morier's journey home from Mexico to London, from March to June 1826.....	755 4 1
Allowance to Dr. Mair, medical attendant on the Commission, half a year, from January 1826 to June 1826	150 0 0
Expenses of Mr. Morier's residence in London, on negotiations with the Mexican minister, 7 months, from June 1826 to January 1827	1,033 6 8
Salary to Mr. Ward, for one year, from January 5, 1826, to January 5, 1827	1,000 0 0
Allowance, as Chargé d'Affaires, of £5 a-day, for one year, from January 5, 1826, to January 5, 1827	1,825 0 0
Allowance for house-rent for one year, from January 5, 1826, to January 5, 1827	300 0 0
Extraordinary expenses of the mission, including salary of attaché, postage, couriers, and journeys, for one year, from January 1826 to January 1827	2,472 18 2
For Mr. Pakenham's outfit, on proceeding to Mexico as Secretary of Legation, in December 1826	175 0 0
To cover his extra expenses on entering upon the situation of his Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires in Mexico	825 0 0
A quarter's salary as Secretary of Legation, to January 5, 1827	175 0 0
Reimbursement to Mr. Drusina, of expenses in bringing from Liverpool despatches from his Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Mexico, in August 1826.....	28 12 0
For the conveyance, by Captain Baldwin, from Philadelphia, of despatches from Mexico, in July 1826	5 5 0
Expense of Mr. Robertson in forwarding despatches from his Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires in Mexico, in the year 1826	4 15 10
Salary to Mr. Ward for one year, from January 5, 1827, to January 5, 1828, at which date his salary and emoluments finally ceased: he has not since enjoyed pension or provision of any kind	1,000 0 0
Allowance as Chargé d'Affaires at £5 a day, from January 5, 1827, to April 18, 1827	515 0 0
Allowance for house-rent at £300 a-year, from January 5, 1827, to April 18, 1827.....	85 14 0
Reimbursement of the extraordinary expenses of the mission, salary of attachés, couriers, and postage, from January 5, 1827, to April 18, 1827.....	732 7 0
Reimbursement, in August 1827, of the excess of the expense of his journey home, beyond the salary due during the voyage and journey.....	191 13 4

COLUMBIAN MISSION.

For the expenses of Mr. COCKBURN, envoy extraordinary, in outfit and equipage, in December 1825, on his appointment to his mission	3,000 0 0
Salary to Mr. Cockburn at £6,000 a-year, from January 5, to July 13, 1827	3,123 14 2
Allowance of £600 a-year for house rent, from January 5, 1827 to July 13, 1827	312 7 5

Reimbursement of the expenses of postage, for the quarter, to July 5, 1827	£ 17 16 4
Expenses of himself and suite, on voyage from Carthagena to England, journey from Falmouth to London, and transport of effects to London	424 8 9
To complete Mr. Cockburn's allowances, from the day on which he quitted Columbia to the day on which he resigned the situation, namely, from the 13th of July, 1827, to the 3d of December following	1,664 17 6
Towards the expenses of Mr. CHAD, Envoy Extraordinary, in outfit and equipage, on his appointment to his mission to Columbia, in April, 1828	1,666 0 0
Allowance of one-half of his salary as Envoy to Columbia, during the period of his <i>detention with his establishment in London</i> , under orders, from July 1828, to January 1829	1,374 16 0
Allowance of one-half of his salary as Envoy to Columbia, during the period of his <i>detention with his establishment in London</i> , under orders, from January to October 1829	2,062 4 0
Salary to COLONEL CAMPBELL for one year, from January 5, 1828, to January 5, 1829	1,000 0 0
Allowance to Chargé d'Affaires, at £5 a-day, for one year, from January 5, 1828, to January 5, 1829	1,830 0 0
Allowance for house-rent for one year, from January 5, 1828, to January 5, 1829	300 0 0
Reimbursement of the extraordinary expenses of the mission, in couriers, postage, and salary of attachés, for one year, from January 1828, to January 1829	887 2 9
Salary to Colonel Campbell for one year, from January 5, 1829, to January 5, 1830	1,000 0 0
Allowance as Chargé d'Affaires, at £5 a-day, for one year, from January 5, 1829, to January 5, 1830	1,825 0 0
Allowance for house-rent for one year, from January 5, 1829, to January 5, 1830	300 0 0
To reimburse to him the extraordinary expenses of the mission, in couriers, postage, and salary to the attaché for one year, from the 1st of January 1829, to the 31st of December 1829 ..	910 5 1
Towards the expenses of Mr. TURNER, in his outfit and equipage in proceeding on his mission	2,500 0 0
Salary, at £5000 a-year, from September 1, 1829, to January 5, 1830	1,752 11 6½
Allowance for house-rent, at £500 a-year, from September 1, 1829, to January 5, 1830	175 5 1½

CONSULAR ESTABLISHMENTS.

These form minor diplomatic appointments, ostensibly established, to watch over the interests of commerce, assist and facilitate the transactions of merchants in foreign parts. The duties being light, and the remuneration considerable, they form a favourite branch of ministerial patronage, and situations therein are mostly obtained by individuals connected with the aristocracy or possessing parliamentary influence. At present the chief objections to the consular establishments are their superfluous number—the expenses they entail on the country in extravagant salaries, pensions, and superannuations—and the unfitness of many persons forced into the situation from the operation of the influence to which we have adverted. In the United States of America, for

example, we have eight consuls, besides consuls-general, enjoying salaries of £800 a year. Both in America and Europe, the office of consul-general is unnecessary; at all events such a functionary might be dispensed with, where we had a regular ambassador and his staff at an enormous charge. Where, for instance, can be the utility or necessity of having a consul-general in Paris? We have an ambassador there, with a salary of £12,100 a year, a secretary of the embassy, and many other individuals attached to the legation in that city; and amongst them, no doubt, a fit individual might be easily found to do the duty at a salary of £500 per annum, for discharging which the present consul-general receives £1200. At Naples we have a consul-general, with £1200 a year, when the whole trade of the kingdom, with all the ports in the world, does not exceed £1,000,000 per annum. But then the climate of Naples is *salubrious*, and it is sometimes convenient to have a sinecure retreat there for an indolent official, or satiated epicure of the "*higher orders*." The consul-general, at Washington, has a salary of £1600 a year. This appears wholly indefensible. In dear countries there is some necessity for high salaries to meet the increased expenditure; but, in cheap countries, like America, there can be no pretext for an exorbitant allowance. £1600 a year is equal to the salary of the chief justice of the United States, and this amount is paid to an officer who, in fact, has nothing to do.

A change of questionable utility was introduced in 1825, in the mode of remunerating consuls; in lieu of payment by fees, fixed salaries were substituted: but, under some pretext or other, fees still continue to be exacted, and the charges altogether imposed by these functionaries on commerce are very considerable. The money paid to the consuls of Columbia alone amounts to a charge of four per cent. on the traffic carried on between the two countries. The whole amount of our exports and imports to South America is about eleven millions; and our consular and diplomatic establishments in these states cost £60,521, the former £27,421 and the latter £33,100. In the trade with some states these expenses are particularly exorbitant. For instance, the consular and diplomatic per centage on our trade with Mexico is £1:0:7, on that with Guatemala £10:17:2; our exports and imports to the former amounting to £731,000, the diplomatic cost to £4,400, and the consular expense to £3000; while our trade to Guatemala amounts only to £13,813, and the consular expense is £1500. There is no necessity for these charges, which result solely from negligence and abuse in the foreign department, from extravagant salaries, from the appointment of consuls to places where none are required, and from the double and treble appointments of consuls, vice-consuls, and consuls-general, when a single individual would be amply sufficient for the discharge of official duty.

The little duty these gentlemen discharge may be inferred from the fact that many hold other situations, apparently requiring their entire personal attention, while others hold the appointment of consul, in America, or distant parts of Europe, and reside, constantly, in the

metropolis. Some of the more glaring abuses in this department, especially those relating to the appointments to the New States of America, were brought before the House of Commons last Session. The speech of Sir James Graham on the subject, from which we subjoin an extract, is well deserving attention.

“ He would begin with the case of Mr. Ricketts, the Consul at Peru, to show the great cost to the public of the system of non-residence, growing partly out of the regulation of fixed salaries and no fees. Mr. Ricketts went to his post in 1825, and passed that year in preparations, and in his voyage out, and he received, for outfit and salary that year, the sum £3855. In 1826, being at his post, he received for salary £2500; for house rent, £510; for a clerk, £250; for extras, £503; making, in the year 1826, the sum of £3763. In 1827 he was on his voyage home, having left his post early in April, and that year he received £2812. His honourable friend was very testy about any charges being adverted to previously to the year 1828; but his honourable friend should recollect that most of the members now on the Treasury Benches are all His Majesty’s Ministers. Though they might disclaim the expenses of that period, all formed a part of Mr. Canning’s administration. But, passing from the year previous to 1828, he came to that year, and 1829, and these two years Mr. Ricketts was in England, and received £1600 a-year. These gentlemen, therefore, had been, under Lord Aberdeen’s government, allowed to *spend two years in England doing nothing, at this large salary*; he had passed one year in his voyage out and home, he had been the rest of his time at his post, and for that period, not quite two years, he had received the sum of £13,600. What he charged as the most flagrant part of the case was, the two years he had been in England at £1600 a-year, and for these two years the present Foreign Minister was wholly responsible. He then came to the case of Mr. Nugent, who was one of those whose services were not accurately stated in the return, as he might possibly make a mistake. This gentleman went in 1825 to Chili, and received, the first year, £3050. In 1826 he was at his post, and received £2500. In 1827, as early as June, or he believed he must now say, as the return was not correct, in June 1828, he returned to England, and received his £2500. His honourable friend described the two years, 1828 and 1829, as years of economy. These two years constituted the golden reign of the Earl of Aberdeen—they were the economical age not deserving of those sarcasms which his honourable friend charged him with using, and entreated him to abandon in bringing forward his motion. His honourable friend had stated that, henceforth, the Consuls, when away from their posts, were to have only half their salaries, but that had not yet been the case, as he had already stated with regard to the Consul of Peru, who had received his salary of £1600 during the two years he had been in England; and it had not been the case with the Consul of Chili, who had received his salary under similar circumstances, one of whom had received in four years, the sum of £13,600, and the other had received £13,050. The next

case he would mention was that of Mr. Mackenzie, who, in 1826, was appointed Consul to Hayti. He received £500 for his outfit, £1500 for his salary, and £215 for his voyage out, in all £2215. In 1826, he was at his post, and received £2710; but he begged to call the particular attention of the House to the year 1827. He received in that year, his salary, £1500; for a journey into the interior of the island, he charged £1290; his house rent and extras amounted to £1070. The honourable baronet mentioned another sum of £147, and for his voyage to England, £192, making a total of £4179.* In 1828 he was in England, and in 1828, when England was under the economic administration of Lord Aberdeen, he received his salary of £1125. He was little more than one year at his post, and for that he received a sum of upwards of £8000. He then came to the case of Mr. Schenley, who was one of those whose services were mis-stated in the Return. He begged to call the attention of the House to Mr. Schenley in particular. This gentleman had been sent as Vice-Consul to Guatemala. In 1825 he received, for his outfit, £300, and for his salary £700; but he did not go, if he understood the Return correctly, that year. He went out in 1826. He was at Guatemala that year and in 1827, and received his salary, of £700; but before the end of 1827 he left Guatemala; and

* The following Bill of Charges, transcribed from the Parliamentary Return, of the Expenses of the Consulate, at Hayti, for the year 1827, will more correctly and fully illustrate the argument of Sir James:—

	£	s.	d.
<i>Charles Mackenzie</i> , Consul General, Salary for one year, from January 5, 1827, to January 5, 1828	1500	0	0
In reimbursement of expenses which he incurred on His Majesty's special service beyond his salary as Consul General; viz.			
Rent of office, from January to August 1827	395	15	6
Contingencies, couriers, information, &c...	681	12	0
Expenses in travels in the interior of the Island	1294	8	7
Banker's commission.....	117	16	4
Expenses of his journey from Hayti to England	192	2	0
In reimbursement of expenses for relief of distressed British subjects	21	16	4
<i>J. Lister</i> Vice-Consul, Salary for one year, from January 5, 1827, to January 5, 1828.....	500	0	0
<i>John Fisher</i> Vice-Consul, Salary for one year, from January 5, 1827, to January 5, 1828, being at £200 a-year, up to the 26th April, 1827, and at £700 a-year from 26th April, 1827 to January 5, 1828.....	546	3	0
<i>H. J. Thompson</i> Vice-Consul, in Remuneration for services, from June 6, 1827, to January 5, 1828 ..	159	5	0
—— <i>Bishop</i> Vice-Consul, Salary for half a-year, from January 5, 1827, to July 5, 1827.....	220	0	0
Total for 1827.....	£5628	18	9

in 1828 he came to England on his full salary. In 1829, under Lord Aberdeen's Foreign Administration, when the public expense had been so much reduced, this gentleman was appointed Consul at Hayti, and received £500 for his outfit. Unless the Returns were erroneous, this was in January; and between January 1829 and January 1830, he received £1200 as his salary. The House would be surprised to learn that he was in England yet; that he had not attempted to go out to Hayti. He remained in England up to that time, and the reason for which he remained the Members of that House would be well able to appreciate. The reason on which he remained in England was "*urgent private business.*" This was a species of reason which would be very intelligible to the Members of that House. In 1829, then, this gentleman received £1700, and never left England; in all, this gentleman had received £4859. The pressure of business at Hayti, the House would imagine, could not be very great; but he found, in the year 1829, that there was a charge for two Vice-Consuls at Hayti. As the Consul was not present, the House would naturally suppose that the Vice-Consuls were there attending to his duty. But he found, by the Return, that Mr. Fisher, the Vice-Consul, was detained in England on *urgent business*. He was in England the whole of 1827, receiving a salary of £550; and in England the whole of 1828, receiving a salary of £550; and he was in England the greater part of 1829. The Consul was then in England; the Vice-Consul also, Mr. Fisher, was in England; and the second Vice-Consul, the one who was on the spot, and did all the business, Mr. Thompson, received £500 a-year. He was at a loss to know what to say, to carry conviction to the minds of Members, if this failed."

To this caustic and able exposure of the abuses in the consular system, we have little further to add in addition to our previous remarks. In 1792 the total charge of our diplomatic and consular establishments, including pensions, amounted to £113,927; in 1829, the same establishments cost £366,000; and the charge of the consular department alone was £121,820, being nearly £8,000 more than the charge of both establishments just before the French revolutionary war. We shall conclude the chapter, with subjoining a few documents abstracted from parliamentary papers, which will illustrate and authenticate our previous exposition, and show the present state of this branch of the national expenditure.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TO FOREIGN MINISTERS. 193

Salaries to Ambassadors and Consuls; Pensions to retired Foreign Ministers; Superannuation Allowances to Consuls; and total Charge of the Diplomatic and Consular Service, from the Year 1822 to 1829, both inclusive.—Abstracted from Parl. Paper, No. 305, Session 1830.

Year.	Salaries to Ambassadors.	Salaries to Consuls.	Pensions to Retired Foreign Ministers.	Pensions to Consuls.	Charge for Diplomats and Consuls.
1822	£144,135	£30,076	£52,206	£1,190	£305,772
1823	139,366	29,749	52,503	1,036	332,453
1824	136,511	33,091	53,547	890	361,728
1825	132,301	32,625	55,938	1,368	418,637
1826	142,584	49,975	53,450	3,370	459,538
1827	132,553	51,100	62,318	3,370	412,859
1828	133,163	50,926	56,772	4,270	407,117
1829	132,149	49,342	54,719	4,870	366,004

Charges of Foreign Missions in the Years 1821, 1826, and 1829, exclusive of Outfits, and every other incidental Outgoing.

	1821.	1826.	1829.
France.....	£12,100	£12,100	£12,100
Russia.....	13,100	13,100	13,100
Austria.....	13,100	12,825	13,000
Spain.....	13,100	8,700	3,887
Netherlands.....	13,100	13,100	13,000
Ottoman Porte.....	10,464	9,800	12,260
Prussia.....	8,200	7,100	6,640
Portugal.....	1,645	9,600	800
Brazil.....	6,550
Two Sicilies.....	6,550	6,550	6,550
United States of America.....	6,550	6,550	6,550
Sweden.....	5,400	5,400	5,400
Bavaria.....	5,209	5,400	5,400
German Diet.....	6,550	3,437	3,712
Denmark.....	5,400	5,400	5,400
Sardinia.....	5,400	5,400	5,650
Saxony.....	4,400	3,325	3,300
Tuscany.....	4,400	4,400	4,400
Wurtemberg.....	4,400	4,400	3,800
Swiss Cantons.....	1,595	3,325	3,300
Hans Towns.....	500
Egypt.....	1,672
Albania.....	1,000	1,000
Greece.....	2,900
	147,713	142,584	132,149

Pensions to late Foreign Ministers, payable out of the Third Class of the Civil List.

Ambassadors.

Lord St. Helens	£2,300
Earl Elgin	2,300
Sir Arthur Paget	2,300
Robert Adair, Esq.	2,300
Sir Gore Ouseley	2,300
Sir Robert Liston	2,300
Earl Cathcart	2,300
Earl of Clancarty	2,300
Lord Stuart de Rothsay	2,300
Viscount Strangford	2,300

Envoys Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary.

Lord Henley	2,000
Sir James Crawford	1,000
Anthony Merry, Esq.	1,700
Alexander Stratton, Esq.	1,500
Hon. W. F. Wyndham	1,700
Right Hon. J. H. Frere	1,700
Hugh Elliott, Esq.	2,700
Lord Robert Fitzgerald	1,700
Sir Edward Thornton	2,000

Envoys Extraordinary.

John Spencer Smith, Esq.	1,200
Hon. Henry Pierrepont	1,200
Thomas Walpole, Esq.	800
Daniel Hailes, Esq.	1,127
John P. Morier, Esq.	1,700
Alexander Cockburn, Esq.	1,700

Ministers Plenipotentiaries.

George Hammond, Esq.	1,200
Right Hon. William Wickham	1,200
Thomas Jackson, Esq.	800
Bartholomew Frere, Esq.	1,200
Lionel Hervey, Esq.	1,200
Edward J. Dawkins, Esq.	900
James Morier, Esq.	800
Earl of Orford	800

Late Secretaries of Embassy.

James Talbot	600
Terrick Hamilton	800

Late Charges d'Affaires.

Charles Keene, Esq.	250
John Lewis Doerfield	250
Rev. Thomas Penrose	250
George Jackson	700

Late Secretaries of Legation.

Charles Oakeley	£500
Francis R. Whery	500
George Sholto Douglas	500
Henry Willock	500

The periods of services, for which these pensions have been granted, vary from three, five, seven, to twenty years. After all the pretended efforts to economise, the charges in the diplomatic department are now nearly fourfold what they were previous to the revolutionary war. The following were the charges in the year 1793:—Salaries and allowances to ambassadors, £83,463; ditto to consuls, £9,295; pensions to retired ministers and consuls, £11,486; and the total charge of the diplomatic and consular service, £113,989.* Compare these charges with similar charges in the first of the preceding tables in the year 1829.

* Parl. Paper, No. 285, Session 1822.

ARISTOCRACY.



ALMOST imperceptibly to ourselves, we are drawn through the different departments of our undertaking in heraldic order: first, we explored the Church in all its ramifications; next the revenues of the Monarch; afterwards the monarch's chief council, and his representatives in the persons of his ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, and ministers plenipotentiary; and now we come to the Aristocracy, which, according to the established rules of precedence, ought to follow the Clergy and the Crown.

Before entering on the more serious details of our present subject, we cannot help pausing a moment, on the threshold, to felicitate ourselves and readers on the triumphs already achieved by the progress of knowledge. Three centuries are only a step in the history of nations, yet, within that period, how many fictions of feudality and priestcraft have been dissipated, and which are now only reverted to as sources of amusement, like the delusions of witchcraft and demonology. Only think of the supremacy of the clergy, in the fifteenth century, when they enjoyed almost impunity for every crime, by exemption from the secular jurisdiction. It strikingly demonstrates the influence of mind over ignorance; for ecclesiastics, at that era, as much excelled the laity in mental attainments as in the magnitude of their possessions. Such pre-eminence is either lost or fast disappearing: in science and information they are manifestly behind other classes of the community; their moral influence is insignificant; the chief advantages they retain are their revenues, and the permanent enjoyment of these not being founded on any claim of right or social utility, public conviction has long since decreed against them, and the general verdict waits only to be carried into execution.

Among the fictions of regality the most preposterous was the claim of *divine right*, which has become too common place a drollery even for mirth. Still it cannot be forgotten, that, so recently as the last of the Stuarts, this dogma had many disciples, and some remains of this singular faith are now to be found. An attempt has been made to

erect a new idol in the pretensions of legitimacy: but, in an age of discussion, imposture cannot long maintain its ground, and this was soon trampled under foot. Previously to the introduction of this idolatry, the English had shown their contempt for hereditary right by the transfer of the crown to the Prince of Orange; the French, by their choice of a patriot king in the person of Philip I.; and the non-interference of the European powers in the mighty movement of 1830 has put an everlasting seal on this species of secular superstition.

Let us next advert to the fictions of the third estate: by some accident the English Aristocracy have contrived to retain a greater proportion of their ancient endowments than any other privileged order of the community. How has this happened? We shall try to explain. First, the English nobility had the good sense to give up in time a portion of their more revolting usurpations, by which they have been enabled to preserve entire, in a more palmy state of enjoyment and for a longer term, the remainder, than any similar class in Europe. Secondly, at an early period of our annals they obtained a hold on popular support, by aiding the people in resisting the encroachments of the clergy and the prerogatives of the Crown. Lastly, and latterly, they have contrived—a portion of them at least—to delude a considerable number of superficial but influential people with a profession of liberal principles, and to persuade them that there is between them a community of object and advantages. However, all these sources of influence are losing their power. For what services the Aristocracy ever rendered to public liberty they have long since been paid a hundred-fold. Their pretext of identity of interest or principle with any section of society has been fully exposed: so that we conclude the proper period has arrived for calling upon them to produce the charter of the immunities they still retain. Like other privileged classes, they have been compelled to surrender some of their pretensions, and the era, we apprehend, has arrived when they must prepare to surrender a great deal more.

There was a time, as every body knows, when LORDS were petty kings on their domains. They had their dungeon-castles, in which they could, at their own arbitrary will, torture, imprison, and even execute, their fellow-creatures. They could, when it suited their sovereign pleasure, sally forth on the public highways, and, with impunity, rob and maltreat whatever luckless traveller they happened to meet. They had even immunities still more revolting to human feeling. One, it is true, can hardly bring the mind to believe that such monstrous usages as those which gave rise to *borough-English* and *child-wit* ever existed; yet that they did is unquestionable, and the memorials of these customs, subsisting in the borough of Stafford, in the county of Essex, and other parts of the kingdom, place the fact beyond dispute. By the former usage, the lord claimed the trifling perquisite, on the occasion of a marriage on his estate, of sleeping the first night with the bride; and the latter designates a penalty which a woman had to pay who had suffered herself to be begotten with child without the lord's permission. Thank heaven our seigneurs have abated something of their ancient

privileges ; still the bare knowledge that such usages once existed—that they are associated with the *name*—is sufficient to make the mere titles of lord, baron, and duke, an offence—an insult to human reason—an abomination—which modern and civilized Europe ought no longer to tolerate.

Having adverted to a few of the ancient impostures and usurpations, chiefly to show to what a depth of degradation human nature may be reduced, we shall proceed to illustrate the immunities and advantages enjoyed by the Aristocracy, and which they have been enabled to arrogate and maintain by a monopoly of political power. It is a subject of vast importance, and one, we believe, when fairly placed before our countrymen, about which there will hardly exist diversity of opinion.

In contemplating the English government, one peculiar feature may be remarked in every branch of our civil and ecclesiastical polity: in each branch there is an entire departure from the original object of its institution. In the ecclesiastical state, no such thing as clerical sinecurists was formerly known; every order had some duties to discharge, for which they received their incomes: but now we find that the episcopal, dignified, and one-third of the parochial clergy receive FOUR OR FIVE MILLIONS annually, for which it is hard to say any service whatever is rendered to society. The House of Commons, originally intended to represent the property, intelligence, and population of the state, has become the mere organ of the Aristocracy; who, according to the constitution, ought not to have the least influence over its deliberations. The executive exhibits a similar dereliction, from its civil and military duties: and, lastly, in the House of Peers we find a similar revolution; the dukes, earls, barons, and different classes of which this order consists, had all, formerly, as their names imply, important duties to discharge in the commonwealth.

The object of reform is not to destroy the established church, pull down the two houses of parliament, nor invade the rights of the Crown; but to restore, as far as the altered state of society will allow, those different orders to the exercise of their legitimate authority.

Of the different innovations on the ancient system, there is none more flagrant than that on the Aristocracy: it has swallowed up not only the rights of the people, and the prerogatives of the Crown, but also the immunities of the church. At no former period of history was the power of the Aristocracy so absolute, nor did they enjoy a tithe of their present advantages. During the Norman Kings, and the first kings of the house of Plantagenet, down to the passing of *Magna Charta*, though the power of the Crown, in many instances, proved but a feeble barrier to the encroachments of the barons, yet, when united with the influence of the clergy, it was at all times able to set some bounds to their authority. After the passing of the *Great Charter*, the growth of manufactures, and the diffusion of knowledge among the people, gave rise to the Commons. This order, unknown to the preceding period, gradually rose into great importance, and ultimately became able not only to prescribe bounds to the Aristocracy,

but also to the Monarch. Under the tyranny of the Stuarts, the Commons brought one monarch to the block, and abolished the House of Peers. But its ascendancy was of short duration. The return of Charles II.—the restoration of the rotten boroughs, which had been struck out of the representation during the protectorship of Cromwell, to the right of returning members of parliament,—the introduction of parliamentary corruption in the reign of Charles II.—more systematically and openly practised under William III. and perfected under the administration of Walpole, in the reign of George II.—completely annihilated the powers of the Commons, and gave to the Aristocracy its uncontrolled and irresponsible ascendancy.

Having obtained the power, the Aristocracy has exercised it as uncontrolled power usually is exercised, namely, solely for their own advantage: they have rid themselves of what duties were anciently annexed to their order, and monopolized nearly all the honours and emoluments of society.

The ancient nobility had not only to provide a sufficient military force for the defence of the kingdom, but they had also the administration of justice, the coining of money, and, in short, the whole internal government of the country committed to their care.* On these conditions, their estates were originally granted. Their estates continue in their hands; but as to the duties annexed, they have placed them on the shoulders of other classes of the community. It is the Commons now, who either discharge, or pay for being discharged, all the duties of the state. If we only examine the list of taxes, as we shortly intend to do, we shall find that the aristocracy have, comparatively, exempted themselves from impost, while the burthen falls exclusively on the people. The duties imposed by the *corn-laws* are a tax paid directly for the support of this order; while, with the exception of the land-tax, a trifling impost, all other duties, the assessed taxes, excise, customs, stamps, post-office duties, fall with disproportionate weight on the middling and working classes, and scarcely touch the massive incomes of the nobility.

This is one of the great evils resulting from the political supremacy of the aristocracy. Instead of bearing the burthen of taxation, which, in fact, is the original tenure on which they acquired their estates, they have laid it on the people. Nothing can be more unjust and oppressive. The comforts of one class ought never to be encroached upon, while another class remains in the enjoyment of redundant luxuries. It is the legitimate object of good government to prevent the extremes of wealth and indigence, and diffuse equally, through all classes, the bounties of nature. But the system of the constitution-mongers is the reverse of this principle. It weighs chiefly on want and penury; it tramples on those already depressed; and crushes, almost to annihilation, the most useful classes, by the unceasing levy of its imposts.

* Blackstone's Comment. b. iv. ch. iv. and v. and Smith's Wealth of Nations, b. iii. ch. iv. where the nature of the ancient tenures is investigated.

It is not our purpose to investigate the utility and origin of an hereditary privileged class. It is, no doubt, a questionable supposition—not supported at least by the cotemporary illustration of many noble families—that wisdom and fitness for the administration of national affairs are inheritable endowments. Besides which, men seldom take pains to cultivate superfluous acquirements; consequently, it is a strong objection to hereditary honours, that those born to them have no necessity for cultivating the virtues by which, perhaps, they were originally acquired. A principal motive for the institution of hereditary rights has ceased to be of weight. Originally it was intended to guard against disputed successions, and prevent the division of powers essential to the security of communities and property. But the introduction of the elective and representative principle in governments, the more general diffusion of intelligence, of habits of order, of respect for individual claims, has rendered these precautions no longer essential to the maintenance of social institutions. Leaving, however, the general discussion of the question, we shall proceed to notice, categorically, the real and practical grievances entailed on the commons of England, by the advantages and immunities of the Aristocracy.

1.—RIGHT OF PRIMOGENITURE AND ENTAILS.

For the last ten years a great deal has been written and said, and justly too, on the evils of monopolies; but hardly any one has touched upon the monopoly of land. Many, even of the Aristocracy, have been zealous and persevering in their endeavours to establish unrestricted freedom in commerce; they perceived the advantages of liberty in the exchange of commodities, but they have been indifferent or silent on the advantages of liberty in the exchange of the soil. Yet, what is the right of primogeniture and the law of entail, but a monopoly as grievous and pernicious as that of the Bank of England and East-India Company? What right had an assembly of half-civilized men, some five hundred years ago, to tie up the great estates of the country in perpetuity; to enact that, whatever changes of society might intervene, they should never be subdivided, nor severed, from their lineal heirs as long as they endured? Was not this creating a monopoly? Did it not interpose insuperable obstacles to the sale and division of property—keep up the price of land to an artificial height—impede fair competition—limit the market of buyers—and impose restrictions on the freedom of those who might be disposed to sell?

Moreover, the statute *De donis*, or of “Great Men,” as it is frequently called, perpetuated a LANDED INTEREST; that is, an order of men with interests distinct from those of the community, and who, armed with the power of the state, have been able to treat with special favour their peculiar class, by imposing upon it lighter burthens, by protecting it from competition, and other expedients which tended directly to their own greatness and emolument by the sacrifice of the general welfare.

The motives which originated this feudal institution, as before observed, have, in great part, ceased to exist. In the disorderly era of Edward I. the right of the first born to the undivided possession of his ancestor was a *law of peace*; and, by consolidating indisputably the power which the entire property gave in the hands of a single person, it was a *law of security*. To divide the inheritance was to ruin it, and to expose the dwellers upon it, who depended on the proprietor for protection, to be oppressed and swallowed up in the desolating incursions of neighbouring and ferocious rivals. In the existing state of society no such pretexts can be urged. The poor as well as the rich enjoy personal security, and the owner of a single acre of land is as secure in the enjoyment as the owner of 100,000. The right of primogeniture, however, still subsists; and as, of all institutions, it is the most adapted to flatter the pride of great families, it will be tenaciously upheld by the Aristocracy. In other respects it is an unmixed evil; it is even injurious to the real interests of the landowners; for nothing can be more contrary to the welfare of a numerous family than a right which, in order to "enrich one, beggars all the rest of the children;" and reduces them to the alternative of obtaining subsistence either as mendicants or depredators on the bounty and involuntary contributions of the community.

The same reasoning applies to ENTAILS, which are the natural consequence of primogeniture. They were introduced to preserve the lineal succession of which primogeniture first gave the idea, and to hinder any part of the original patrimony from being conveyed out of the proposed line, either by gift, devise, or alienation, either by the folly or by the misfortune of any of its successive possessors. When great landed estates were a sort of principality, such curtailed inheritances might not be indefensible. Like what are called the fundamental laws of some communities, they might frequently hinder the security of thousands from being endangered by the incapacity or extravagance of one man. But, in the existing state of Europe, when property is so well secured, when small as well as great estates derive their security from inviolable laws, nothing can be more absurd than such defensive restrictions. They are founded upon the most absurd of all suppositions, the supposition that every successive generation of men have not an equal right to the earth and to all that it possesses; but that the property of the present generation should be fettered and regulated by barbarians, who died centuries ago. Entails, however, are still respected in England; and it is only in particular cases, by means of legal fictions, prompted by the spirit of commerce, and new views of social expediency, that estates tied up by them can be alienated.* They are deemed essential to the maintenance of the monopoly of the aristocracy in the enjoyment of political power, honour, dignities, and offices; having usurped many advantages over

* Humphreys on the Laws of Real Property, 2d edit. p. 31.

their fellow citizens, lest their poverty should render them ridiculous, it is thought reasonable that they should have others. It is, however, an oppressive and indefensible grievance. In the present state of society there is no utility in guaranteeing to particular families the perpetual enjoyment of vast masses of property—that this property shall not be liable to the ordinary vicissitudes of life—that it shall not, like personal estates, either be devisable or saleable—and that all, except members of the privileged order, shall be irrevocably interdicted from ever becoming proprietors of the soil—of that soil which is the common inheritance of the whole community.

Other evils result from this feudal institution. Primogeniture enriches one, and leaves all the other members of a family destitute. Hence they are thrown, like mendicants, on the public for support; but they are unlike mendicants in this—that the public has no option, whether they will support them or not. The Aristocracy, usurping the power of the state, have the means, under various pretexts, of extorting, for the junior branches of their families, a forced subsistence. They patronize a ponderous and sinecure church-establishment; they wage long and unnecessary wars, to create employments in the army and navy; they conquer and retain useless colonies; they set on foot expensive missions of diplomacy, and keep an ambassador or consul, and often both, at almost every petty state and every petty port in the world; they create offices without duties, grant unmerited pensions, keep up unnecessary places in the royal household, in the admiralty, the treasury, the customs, excise, courts of law, and every department of the public administration: by these, and other expedients, the junior as well as elder branches of the great families are amply provided for out of the taxes. They live in profusion and luxury; and those by whom they are maintained alone subsist in indigence and privation.

It is only in the less civilized states of Europe, in Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, and Russia, that primogeniture is retained. Countries enjoying the benefits of political regeneration have abolished this remnant of feudality, and introduced the law of equal partibility. The happy effects of this reform are visible in the condition of France and the Netherlands; in the greater harmony subsisting among the different classes of society—in the absence of the miserable jealousy and exclusiveness that embitter domestic intercourse in England—in the public spirit, unanimity, and personal independence of the inhabitants, produced, no doubt, by a conviction of common interests, reciprocal obligations, and the equal participation in all the advantages and enjoyments of the social state.

II.—PRIVILEGES OF PEERS.

There are some other laws originating in the same aristocratic spirit, and directed to the maintenance of similar exclusive privileges as those described in the last section. Such are the Insolvent Laws. Lest the

dignity of a peer should be violated, his person is privileged from arrest for debt. Why should this be tolerated? He is not ostensibly entrusted with representative functions, like the members of the lower house. He represents only himself, with the exception of the sixteen peers of Scotland and the twenty-eight peers of Ireland. Why, then, should his person be protected from imprisonment, if he is so inexcusably improvident, with all the advantages he enjoys, as to incur debts he cannot pay? A *Scotch peer*, though not one of those sitting in parliament, is privileged from arrest, as appears from the case of Lord Mordington. This lord, who was a Scotch peer, but not one of those who sat in parliament, being arrested, moved the Court of Common Pleas to be discharged, as being entitled, by the Act of Union, to all the privileges of a peer of Great Britain; and prayed an attachment against the bailiff; when a rule was granted to show cause. Upon this, the bailiff made an affidavit that, when he arrested the said lord, he was so mean in his apparel, as having a worn-out suit of clothes, and a dirty shirt on, and but sixteen pence in his pocket, he could not suppose him to be a peer of Great Britain, and, therefore, through inadvertency, arrested him. The Court discharged the lord, and made the bailiff ask pardon.

A peer, sitting in judgment, is not required to give his verdict upon oath, like a commoner, but upon his *honour*. What a stigma on the other classes of the community! Just as if a peer alone had *honour*, and all others were base perfidious slaves, from whom truth could only be extorted when they had been forced into the presence of their Creator.

A member of the lower house is the deputy or representative of others, and cannot delegate his powers, but a peer represents only himself, and may vote by proxy on any question, even though he has never been present to discuss its merits.

If a thief breaks into a church, and steals the surplus or cushion, it is not like stealing a ledger or cash-box from a shop or counting-house—it is *sacrilege*. If a man scandalizes a peer, by speaking evil of him, it is not common scandal, it is *scandalum magnatum*, that is, great scandal, subjecting the offender to indefinite punishment.

If a peer jobs in the funds, as many of them do; or if he gets up bubble companies, as some of them have done, to dupe credulous people; and if he involves himself in debt by these fraudulent practices, you cannot imprison him to enforce payment; neither can you make him a bankrupt, and sequester his estates. The property of a peer, like his person, has a *dignity* about it, and must not be violated. You may knock down Nathan Rothschild, though he is a very rich man, or a worshipful alderman, or even a right honourable lord mayor, and the justices will only charge you a few shillings for the liberty you have taken; but, if you knock down a peer, though he is ever so insolent, it is almost as bad as murder.

Peers being great landowners, therefore, land, as well as their persons, enjoys immunities which do not attach to chattel property.

A noble lord may run into as much debt as he pleases, and then, with impunity, defraud all his creditors. He may live in the utmost profusion; he may borrow money to support his extravagance, or for providing portions for younger children, making the most solemn promises, or even giving his *written* engagement to repay it; or he may raise loans, and with these loans buy houses and land, and when he dies leave the houses and land purchased with this borrowed money to whom he pleases: and in all these cases the lenders who have trusted to the honour of a peer have no power to touch a shilling worth of his real estates.

These are a few of the privileges of peers; we shall proceed to illustrate other results of aristocratic legislation.

III.—INJUSTICE OF ARISTOCRATIC TAXATION.

Nothing can demonstrate more incontestably the necessity of the different interests in society being represented in the general government than the course of fiscal legislation. The political power of the state we need not repeat nor explain is, in this country, consolidated in the aristocracy. If we only glance at public burthens we shall see with what admirable adriotness they have been distributed, so as to press as lightly as possible on those who imposed them, and with disproportionate weight on those who had no share in their imposition. Does not this show better than all the general reasoning in the world the utility of universal representation; otherwise, whatever interest is unprotected will assuredly be sacrificed, and this injustice will be perpetuated by the dominant party, however exalted this dominant party may be by birth, by station, by education, by wealth, or other adventitious circumstance.

Let us appeal to facts in illustration of this principle. The landed interest is the primary interest of the Aristocracy; whatever tends to enhance the value of land or its produce tends directly to augment their incomes. Hence, their leading policy has been to protect agriculture, to encourage husbandry, by abstaining from burthening it with imposts, to impose no additional tax on land, and above all things to secure the *home market* against competition from abroad. For this latter purpose they have passed laws the most unjust and outrageous; the importation of some articles they have absolutely prohibited; others they have loaded with heavy duties; so that they have been able to sell their own produce at a monopoly price.

The following list of articles of foreign production, and the import duties to which they are subject, will show to what extent the land-owners have availed themselves of political power to promote their own interests, by excluding foreign competition.

	£	s.	d.
Bacon, per cwt.	1	8	0
Beer, per thirty-two gallons.....	2	13	0
Butter, per cwt.	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
Bristles, not sorted, per lb.	0	0	3
Bristles, sorted	0	0	4
Cider, per ton	21	10	0
Cheese, per cwt.	0	10	6
Cucumbers, <i>ad valorem</i>	20	0	0
Eggs, for every 120	0	0	10
Hay, per load	1	4	0
Hair, cows and oxen, per cwt.	0	2	6
Hair-powder, per cwt.	9	15	0
Hops, per cwt.	8	11	0
Hemp-seed, per quarter	2	0	0
Hemp, undressed, per cwt.	0	4	6
Lard, per cwt.	0	8	6
Madder, per cwt.	0	6	0
Mules and asses, each	0	10	6
Horses, each	1	0	0
Oil, rape and linseed, per ton	39	18	0
Peas, per bushel	0	7	6
Perry, per ton	22	13	8
Potatoes, per cwt.	0	2	0
Seeds, clover, hay, &c.	1	0	0
Spirits, foreign, per gallon (I. M.)	1	2	6
Rum, per gallon	0	8	6
Tallow, per cwt.	0	3	2
Tares, per quarter	0	10	0
Timber, per load	2	15	0

Wheat 16s. 5d. a quarter to 1s. according as the price rises from 61s. to 70s. a quarter.

Barley 13s. 10d. a quarter to 1s. according as the price rises, from 32s. to 40s. a quarter.

Oats 10s. 9d. a quarter to 1s. according as the price rises from 24s. to 31s. a quarter.

Beef, lamb, mutton, pork, sheep, and swine are prohibited to be imported, by 6 Geo. IV. c. 117.

While the landowners have been strenuously exerting themselves to close, hermetically, if possible, the home market against foreign agricultural produce, they have, with admirable consistency of policy, been, at the same time, endeavouring to throw it wide open for the admission of foreign manufactures. This places their conduct in a most conspicuous light. Surely, if a free trade in manufactures was for the benefit of the community, so was a free trade in the produce of the soil. But, then, our feudal Solons do not deal in cotton, nor silk, nor hardwares; they are only dealers in corn, and that makes all the difference.

It is not a difficult problem to ascertain the annual burthen imposed on the community by the corn-tax. It appears, from the resolutions submitted

to the House of Commons last session, by Lord Milton, that the average price of wheat in this country, in the year ending February, 1830, had been 64s. 2d. per quarter. The average price on the Continent and in America, during the same period, had been 46s. 3d. per quarter. Now, if there were no restrictions on the importation of corn, the price in England would be nearly the same as in Poland or in the United States; but, in consequence of the boroughmongers' tax, the price is about 20s. per quarter higher: so that, if the annual consumption of corn by the community be 48 millions of quarters, they pay exactly so many pounds additional, in order to swell the rents of the land-owners.

A tax upon bread is the most oppressive and unjust that could be imposed on the industrious classes. A man with £50 a year consumes, individually, as much bread as a man with £50,000, and, consequently, sustains as great an annual loss by the artificial enhancement of its price. All taxes on articles of ordinary consumption fall in the same disproportionate manner. They are like a fixed per centage on income, levied indiscriminately on every person, without regard to large or small revenues. Sugar, tea, and malt are articles of general use; and the labourer and artizan contribute exactly in the same proportion as a lord on their individual consumption of those commodities. In fact, it is to duties of this description the Aristocracy have always shown a marked partiality: the excise, it is known, being the most productive branch of the revenue. Mr. Pitt used to say that the high price of labour in England was chiefly from the excise; three-fifths of the wages of a poor man passing into the exchequer. But no such proportion of the incomes of the Aristocracy flow into the public treasury.

Yet it is the incomes of the landed interest, as we shall briefly illustrate, which form the most legitimate and unexceptionable fund for taxation. A person who employs himself in making a pair of shoes or inexpressibles adds nothing to the value of the leather or cloth beyond the price of his labour. Land, however, is a more profitable material to work upon; yielding not only a produce adequate to defray the expenses of its culture, but also a surplus: and this surplus constitutes the landlord's rent. But the soil of every country belongs to the people; consequently, the rent or surplus revenue it yields is not so much the property of a particular class of individuals as of the whole community. It follows that the landowners are only so many *pensioners* or *sinecurists*, paid out of a revenue which originally constituted the sole fund out of which all the exigencies of state were provided. Instead of the "Lords of the Soil" taxing every article we eat and drink, and impeding, with vexatious imposts, every operation of industry, they ought to have laid a direct tax on rent, which would have been easily and economically collected. They have acted quite the reverse. The Land-Tax continues to be levied at this day according to the defective valuation in the reign of William III.; and, in 1798, it was made perpetual at 4s. in the pound on the inadequate estimate of

the rental at the Revolution. In France the *foncier*, or land-tax, amounts to one-fourth of the whole annual revenue ;* in England it does not amount to a sixtieth part. The proportion of our excise, custom, and assessed taxes to similar taxes in France, is as forty-five to twenty ; while the proportion of the public revenue of the former to that of the latter is as three to two.

Need we say anything further to illustrate the tendency of aristocratic taxation, or the *selfish purposes* to which the political power of the Oligarchy has been perverted ? Yes, we shall briefly add a few more facts.

When the income-tax was imposed, or rather when it was screwed up by the Whigs, in 1806, lands and tenements were assessed at 2s. in the pound. Precisely the same assessment was laid on incomes arising from professions, trade, or other vocation. Thus was as heavy a tax levied on revenue not worth five years' purchase as on revenue worth thirty years' purchase ; in other words, the tax was *six times heavier* on the industrious than on the unproductive classes of the community. A merchant, attorney, tradesman, or shopkeeper, whose income depended entirely on his personal exertions—which ceased at his death—and by savings from which he could alone make a provision for his children after his decease, was taxed six times to the amount of the landowner, by whom the burthen was imposed—whose property was entailed, and protected from all liability for debts however extravagantly incurred.

If the Boroughmongers ever charge themselves with any burthens they are always prompt to get rid of them the first opportunity, though they touch them ever so lightly, and have been rendered necessary by their own infatuated measures. Thus, immediately after the peace, before any reduction in the public establishments, or in the amount of the monstrous debt they had contracted, the income-tax was abolished. Again, the duty on horses employed in *husbandry* has been long since repealed, but the *malt-tax* is still continued, and the beer-duty—the most unfair and oppressive of all duties—was only repealed last session of parliament.

From some duties the peerage is exempted altogether. A lord of parliament sends and receives all letters *free of postage* ; he usually franks the letters of all his relatives and friends ; he enjoys, also, the privilege of sending a letter from London by the post on *Sunday*—a sort of sabbath-breaking which would be considered impiety or perhaps blasphemy in another person.

It would be tedious to go through the whole roll of taxes, to show how indulgent our legislators have been to themselves and how unjust towards the rest of the community. If a lord by inheritance succeed to an estate worth £100,000, he has not a shilling to pay to government. If a rich merchant dies, and bequeaths as much to his children, they are taxed to the amount of £1500, or, if there is *no will*, to the

* Lowe's Present State of England, p. 318.

amount of £2250. If a poor man buys a cottage for £10, he has 10s. or one-twentieth part of the purchase-money, to pay for a conveyance. If a nobleman buys an estate worth £50,000 the stamp-duty is only one-hundred-and-eleventh part of the purchase-money, or £450. A similarly unequal tax is incurred in borrowing *small* sums on bond or mortgage, while special favour is shown to those who borrow *large* sums. If a man has eight windows in his house he is assessed 16s. 6d.; if he has *one* more he is charged 4s. 6d. for it. If a lord has 180 windows he is charged £46:11:3; and if he has *one* more he is charged only 1s. 6d.; and he may have as many more additional windows as he pleases at the same low rate of assessment. If a poor man's horse, or his ass, passes through a toll-bar there is something to pay, of course; but if a lord's horse passes through, provided it is employed on the lord's land, there is nothing to pay. If a cart passes through a toll-bar, loaded with furniture or merchandize, there is something to pay for the cart, and something extra to pay according as the wheels are broad or narrow; but if the cart is loaded with manure for his lordship's estate the *cart is free*, and the wheels may be any breadth the owner pleases without liability to extra charges. If a poor man refreshes himself with a glass of spirits (though beer would be better for his health and pocket) he is taxed seventy per cent.; but if he takes a glass of wine, which is a lord's drink, he is only taxed seventeen per cent. Lords do not smoke, though they sometimes chew, therefore, a pipe of tobacco, which is a poor man's luxury, is taxed 400 per cent. If a poor servant-girl advertises for a place of *all work* she is taxed 3s. 6d.; if a lord advertises the sale of an estate he pays no more. The house-tax falls heavily on the industrious tradesman, but lightly on the lord and esquire; the former must reside in town, and occupy spacious premises, which make his rent large, and the tax being proportionate, it deducts materially from income, while the latter may reside in the country, occupy a fine mansion, and not be rented more than £50 per annum. Lastly, lords and gentleman may retire to Paris, Florence, or Brussels, for any thing they have to do, or any good they are capable of doing, by which they avoid house-tax, window-tax, and almost every other tax; but the tradesman and shop-keeper are *ad scriptæ glæbæ*,—they must stick to their counting houses and warehouses, and expiate, by toil and frugality, the follies and extravagance of their rulers.

These are a few specimens of our fiscal regulations: we should never have done were we to notice all inequalities and oppressions resulting from aristocratic taxation. What we have said must, we imagine, demonstrate, practically, to merchants, copyholders, shopkeepers, tradesmen, and the middling and working orders generally, the advantages of having a *friend at court*—that is, of having political rights—that is, of having real representatives—that is, of not being taxed without their consent—that is, of having a reform in the Commons House of Parliament, instead of leaving public affairs to the exclusive management of noble lords and their nominees.

IV.—ARISTOCRATIC GAME-LAWS.

A salmon from the pool, a wand from the wood, and a deer from the hills, are thefts which no man was ever ashamed to own.—*Fielding's Proverbs.*

We learn, from this old Gaelic apophthegm, the sentiment is very ancient, that an exclusive right to game and other *feræ naturæ* does not rest on the same basis as property. Mankind will not be easily convinced that stealing a hare or partridge is as criminal as stealing a man's purse. While this continues the popular feeling it is vain to multiply acts for the preservation of game. Laws, to be efficacious, should be in accordance with public opinion; if not, they only disturb the peace of society, excite ill-blood and contention, and multiply instead of diminishing offences.

But our Norman lawgivers are not satisfied that game shall be protected like *property* merely; they wish to elevate it into something far more sacred; they have arbitrarily fixed on certain fowls of the air and beasts of the field, and these, in their sovereign pleasure, they have decreed shall be endowed with peculiar privileges distinct from all others; in a word, that they shall be *aristocrats* like themselves, and it shall be highly criminal in any base-born man to kill them, or eat them, or buy them, or sell them, or carry them, or even to have them in his possession, or to have in his possession any engine or instrument by which the dear and favoured creatures can be slain, maimed, or injured. In pursuance of these lordly whims they have framed a code of laws to which we will venture to say, in subtlety and refinement of insult, nothing equal can be found in the records of the vilest despotism ever established to experiment on the limits of human endurance; we will venture to say that, in no other country in the world, with the least pretence to freedom and civilization, is there to be found a body of laws so partial, so repugnant to the common sense and subversive of the common rights of mankind, as the game laws of the English aristocracy!

What is it that our insolent oppressors have determined shall be the *qualification* to kill game? Why, that a man shall have a real estate of £100 a-year, free of incumbrance. There being fifty times more property required to enable a person to kill a partridge than to vote for a knight of the shire. A rich merchant or manufacturer has no right to kill game; his warehouses may be filled with valuable merchandize; he may give employment to thousands of people, as some of them do in the North, yet have no privilege to meddle with the aristocrats of the air nor of the field. Their wealth is *base*—it is not feudal, it has not been acquired by war, plunder, and confiscation, and does not qualify them to spring woodcocks, no, nor even to pop at a snipe, nor a teal, nor a quail, nor a land-rail. A *parson*, however, who has a living worth £150 per annum, though his estate is only for life, may kill as much game as he pleases.

But the sages of the King's Bench (blessed be their names!) have been more indulgent than the Upper House: they have determined that even plebeians shall have a little *sport*, and have accordingly ruled that a qualified person may take out a stock-broker, clothier, attorney, surgeon, or other inferior person *to beat the bushes, and see a hare killed*, and they shall not be liable to penalty. But, beware of the man-traps and spring-guns of the law; if any of the aforesaid ignoble beings venture to meddle, without first being *invited* by a gentleman so to do, he shall be fined, or else imprisoned in the House of Correction.* Ah, these boroughmongers, how they stab us! how they kick us! how they laugh at us!

Although an unqualified man is not allowed to kill game, it might be thought, by a rational mind, he would be permitted *to buy* it of those who are. No, he is not. What, the lords of the soil become dealers and chapmen! degrade grouse and black cock into mere commodities of traffic, like broad cloth and calico! Impossible! Therefore, they have passed laws that game shall neither be bought nor sold; that higglers, victuallers, poulterers, pastry-cooks, and other mean persons shall not carry it, nor have it in possession, nor shall any unqualified person have in his possession any deadly or dangerous weapon for its injury or destruction. If an unqualified person be only *suspected*—barely suspected, mind—of having game, or any dog, gun, or snare for killing or wounding it, his house may be SEARCHED, and if any net or snare, pheasant, partridge, fish, fowl, or other game is found, the offender may be forthwith carried before a justice and fined, or sent to the House of Correction, and there whipped, and kept to hard labour. If a man only happen to spoil or *tread* on the egg of a partridge, pheasant, mallard, teal, bittern, or heron, he is liable to fine or imprisonment. But if he go forth in the night for the third time, with the full intent of catching an aristocrat bird, a coney, or other game, he may be *transported beyond the seas for seven years*, or imprisoned, and kept to hard labour, in the House of Correction for two years; and if he run away, in order to avoid this merciful infliction, and resists the land-owner or his servants, either with club, stick, or stone, rather than be apprehended, he is guilty of a misdemeanour, subjecting him either to transportation or imprisonment.

Now, mark the commentary afforded by the NIMRODS themselves on these preposterous, arrogant, and savage enactments. Within very few years three parliamentary committees have been appointed to inquire into the state and administration of the game-laws; the results of their inquiries are—that poaching cannot be prevented—that buying and selling game cannot be prevented—that the game-laws are the fruitful sources of crime and immorality, and fill the gaols with delinquents, and that the only means of remedying the evils are by allowing game to be openly sold like other commodities, and by altering the qualifica-

* 5 Ann, c. 14, and decisions thereon; Loft, 178; 15 East Reports, 462.

tions, so that every owner of land may not only have the liberty to kill game on his own estate, but be empowered to grant a similar indulgence to any other individual. Instead of acting on the knowledge so communicated, or the suggestions recommended; instead of repealing the absurd laws which are the sole cause of game being so highly prized, and of the deadly nocturnal encounters between keepers and poachers; instead of doing any of these, the only measures that have been carried are the 7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 29, and the 9 Geo. IV. c. 69, which greatly augment the sanguinary character of a code already too ferocious, and the everlasting opprobrium of the misnamed free and enlightened community which tolerates them.

But observe what was disclosed respecting the *sale of game*, about which the descendants of the Normans have been so extremely fastidious. From the inquiries of the committee of the House of Lords, in 1828, it appears game is a regular article of sale in all the principal markets of the metropolis: the penalties, indeed, which are imposed on the traffic are easily evaded; since, by one sapient and moral act of our legislators, the 58 Geo. III. if a person who has incurred them to any amount will only inform of some other person who has bought or sold game, within the preceding six months, his penalties are remitted and he receives the informer's reward, for this neighbourly, and, as it is now practised, friendly treachery. One salesman sold, on the average, 500 head of game in a week; in one year he sold 9628 head of game. The sale is mostly on commission, at two-pence or three-pence a head. It will naturally excite surprise how all these waggon loads of game can be conveyed to London, and by whom supplied. The poor labourer, mason, or weaver, who perils his life, his limbs, and his health, in the covert attempt to catch a hare or partridge, cannot possibly be adequate to support a commerce like this. No; it is not done by poaching exactly; the *wholesale* dealers are the law-makers themselves—those who have interdicted the traffic—*noble lords* and *men of title*, who have condescended to supply the London poulterers and salesmen with game, on commission, as a means of augmenting their territorial revenues.—See the Report of the Lords Committee in 1828, and the able letter of Lord Suffield on the subject.

We shall only trouble our readers with one or two more observations on the game-laws, which Mr. Justice Blackstone denominated a “bastard class of the forest-laws.” But the fact is, they are a refinement in insult on the savage code of William Rufus. The territorial jurisdiction of the forest-laws, though extensive enough in all conscience, had their local boundaries; at least, they did not extinguish the old common-law right every proprietor exercised to kill and have all animals, *feræ naturæ*, found on his own land. These inroads on the most obvious rights of property and the common sense of mankind, were left for a much more recent period,—a period subsequent to the glorious Revolution; for, though the Qualification Act was passed in the reign of Charles II. the statutes which first made it penal to sell game, or for an unqualified person to have game in his possession, were not passed

till the reigns of William III. and George II. Lest our authority on this point may not be deemed sufficient we insert a short extract from the Report of the Parliamentary Committee, in 1816.

“ Your Committee cannot but conclude that, by the common-law, any possessor of land has an exclusive right, *ratione soli*, to all the animals, *fera natura*, found upon his land, and that he may pursue and kill them ; and that he may now, by the common law, which in so far continues unrestrained by any subsequent statute, support an action against any person who shall take, kill, or chase them.”

With this extract we shall conclude. For this single object—that of getting rid of the demoralizing, detestable, ferocious, and preposterous game-code ; we say for this one object alone, without adverting to the church, the rotten boroughs, the dead weight, or other national grievance ; only to sweep away this one national stigma would be well worth the *three days' fight* of the Parisians, or even the four days' battle of the brave Belgians.

V.—INCOMES OF THE ARISTOCRACY.

We are not partizans of Agrarian laws, and we believe the number of political reformers of any sect is extremely diminutive who wish to see or who ever expect to see a Spencean division of property. Industry, perseverance, sobriety, and prudence will mostly acquire wealth, and deserve to acquire it, and to enjoy it, and to transmit the enjoyment, after death, to those they most esteem. These are elements of society which few, indeed, would ever wish to see violated. They are primary laws of social organization of which every one almost instinctively feels the justice and utility.

Neither are there many, we apprehend, who wish to abolish civil distinctions. A legislator sufficiently wise and experienced to discharge his high functions ; a judge or magistrate qualified by probity and learning to adjudicate civil and criminal wrongs ; a great public officer meriting and filling a high civil appointment ; or a great commander, able and brave, to direct the military power of the state : these are all distinctions which every one must respect and venerate ; and if it be necessary to distinguish the holders by other symbols than the official titles—by a velvet cap, a coronet, or ermined robe, with two, three, or four guards, or a golden epaulette—they will respect and venerate these too. Nay, there are not many, we believe, who care because there is “ my lord ” this, or his “ grace ” of that, or the “ most noble ” t'other thing ; these are not matters of pith and moment—they are too childish, we would hope, either to mislead the beholder, or corrupt the possessor.

It is not civil distinctions, but the nuisance of civil usurpations the just and enlightened wish to see abated. An aristocracy of office, of acquirement, and desert, is a natural aristocracy ; but an aristocracy of birth is a feudal barbarism which honours the shadow in place of the substance, and dissevers merit from its just reward. Hereditary right

to property we can comprehend, but hereditary right to be legislators, bishops, post-captains, military commanders, and secretaries of state, shocks common sense. One is a private immunity, transmissible from father to son; the other are public functions, which can never be alienated to any order of men; they belong to the living, and cannot be bequeathed and regulated by the dead; they are adjuncts to the present not to a past generation.

We have thought it advisable to preface our present subject with these preliminaries, lest our purpose might be misconstrued. Our intention is to say something of the possessions of the Aristocracy, and we were apprehensive lest it might be imagined we meditated *spoliation*, or beheld, with jealous eye, the magnitude of their acres and rental. All such constructions we disclaim. It is nothing to us, nor is it much to the public, that the marquis of Stafford has £360,000 per annum; the duke of Northumberland, £300,000; the duke of Buccleugh, £250,000; and that there are other dukes and marquesses with nearly as much. Such magnificent revenues are not enjoyed by noblemen alone. There are lords of the loom in Lancashire and Yorkshire who have accumulated incomes nearly as great, and, perhaps, not more humanely nor honourably. But, if such masses of wealth be evils, they are evils which would remedy themselves, were they not fostered and upheld by vicious legislation. Abolish the laws which consecrate these vast accumulations and minister to family pride and personal caprice, and the mere diversities in the characters of succeeding possessors would soon disintegrate the great properties.

It is neither the mansions nor parks of the peerage that excite popular cupidity; it is the hereditary monopoly—not by constitutional right, but usurpation—of the political franchises of the people which begets hostile feelings; because it enables the privileged usurpers to tax others and not themselves—to engross all public honours, offices, and emoluments—in a word, to make all the great social interests of a vast community, of which, in number, intellect, and even wealth, they constitute a most insignificant portion, subservient solely to the purposes of their own vanity, folly, indulgence, and aggrandizement. Here is the national grievance; and let us inquire whether, from the adventitious circumstance of property, they have any claim to inflict this great wrong on the community.

The most authentic data for ascertaining the distribution of the property and revenue of the different classes of society are the returns under the property-tax. But it is to be observed that these returns only include the annual value of property liable to the tax, and, consequently, do not exhibit the annual value of the smaller incomes, nor the amount of that great mass of revenue accruing from the wages of labour. Bearing this in mind, we shall submit a statement of the annual income arising from property, professions, public annuities, profits in trade, pensions, and offices: and the amount of the gross assessments on the several descriptions of revenue arising from the different sources of income. The return is for the year ending April 5th, 1815—the last

of the income-tax—and is abstracted from the Parliamentary Paper, No. 59, Session 1823. We have omitted shillings and pence, which make some trifling inaccuracies in the totals, and, to render the statement more intelligible, have added the titles of the schedules and rate of assessment from the 48 Geo. III. c. 65. The rise in the value of the currency has probably depressed the nominal amount of incomes below the cotemporary increase in produce and industry; but, as this change affected all classes alike, with the exception of annuitants and those enjoying fixed money-payments, it has not altered the relative *proportion of revenue*, as exhibited by the returns of 1815, possessed by the different divisions of the community. Here follows the statement:—

Schedules.	Annual Value.	Gross Assessments.
	£	£
(A.)—Lands, tenements, and hereditaments, for every 20s. of the annual value 2s.....	60,138,330.....	5,923,486
(B.)—Occupiers of lands, dwelling-houses, and tenements, 1s. 6d.; Scotland, 1s.	38,396,143.....	2,734,450
(C.)—Annuities and dividends arising out of any public revenues, 2s.	28,855,050.....	2,885,505
(D.)—Increase and profits from professions, trade, or vocations, 2s.	38,310,935.....	3,831,088
(E.)—Public offices, pensions, and stipends, 1s. 6d.	11,744,557.....	1,174,455
Total.....	<u>£177,451,015.....</u>	<u>£16,548,984</u>

The most important item for our purpose is the property charged in schedule A. consisting of lands and tenements which were assessed on the rack rents, and profits from mines and quarries. Under this head the assessment charged on land; houses, mines, &c. appears, from the parliamentary return, to which reference has been made, to have been as follows:—

	£
Lands chargeable under the general rule	39,405,705
Houses so chargeable.....	16,250,399
Particular properties chargeable on the annual profits, viz. tithes, manors, fines, quarries, mines, iron works, and non-enumerated profits	4,473,224
	<u>£60,138,330</u>

From this it appears that the entire rental returned in the last year of the property-tax was £39,405,705, and which has been reduced since the peace, in the opinion of Mr. Lowe, to twenty-five millions. Now the question is, what portion of this rental is received by the four hundred members of the *House of Peers*. The Scotch and Irish peers, to the number of one hundred and eighty, who only sit in the Upper House, by their representatives, we exclude from consideration; the object being to get at the incomes of those who exercise the political power of the empire. For this purpose it will be necessary to analyze the component

parts of the landed interest, and separate the peers from those who share with them the territorial revenues of the kingdom.

The number of baronets is 658, and many of them enjoy landed incomes as great or greater than lords. Then there is the *squirearchy*, more numerous than Pharoah's host, who draw freely from the surplus produce of the soil. To these must be added the great loan-contractors, merchants, manufacturers, and others, appertaining to the monied, mercantile, and trading classes, many of whom possess extensive estates, and who rival, and, in part, have superseded the ancient nobility. Dr. Colquhoun supposed the gentry, and the classes we have enumerated, as enjoying large incomes, to amount to 46,861, and their incomes, from land and other sources, to amount to £53,022,110. Besides which, allowance must be made for the estates of the younger children of noble families, and for lands appertaining to lay and ecclesiastical corporations, and to charitable foundations. From all these considerations we should conclude that the rental of peers, sitting in parliament, does not exceed *three millions per annum*. Some of the members of the Upper House, we are aware, enjoy vast revenues, but the average income of each, from the soil, does not exceed £7,500.

Mr. Hallam says the richest of the English aristocracy derive their possessions from the spoils of the Reformation. He ought, also, to have added the spoils of the crown-lands, for they have helped themselves freely to the possessions of both church and king, as well as the people. The Bentinck, the Pelham, and Petty families inherit vast properties from leases and alienations of the royal domains. The houses of Cavendish and Russell, it is well known, made their acquisitions at the Reformation. The foundation of the Fitzwilliam estates was advantageous purchases at the same era. The Lonsdales have dug out their wealth from coal-mines. The Buccleugh property has been an accumulation from heiresses, including here in England the possessions of the duke of Montague. The Gower estates have, also, mainly come by marriages; but the grand augmentation was by the canal-property of the late duke of Bridgewater, to which are now to be added the Sutherland estates of the present marchioness—a principality in themselves. The Grosvenor riches came mainly from an heiress, who brought, in marriage, the London building land about two generations back. The Northumberland estates are, principally, the old feudal inheritance of the Percys. In the whole peerage there are only eighteen commercial families, and these form the only houses which can be said to have acquired their wealth by habits of peaceful and honest industry.

Granting, then, that by means of marriages, and other favourable circumstances, some few of the nobility have accumulated vast revenues, still there are others whose poverty is notorious, and, altogether, they do not enjoy a landed revenue exceeding three millions per annum. What right, then, it may be inquired, have an Oligarchy of 400 persons, possessing so small a share in the general wealth of the community, to monopolize political power. Three millions per annum is not one-hundredth part of the annual revenue of the kingdom.* Yet, to a

* Lowe's Present State of England, App. p. 65.

body of men, having so diminutive a stake in the general weal, is confided the destinies of the empire.

The revenues derived by the peerage from the taxes and church revenues have been estimated to amount to £2,825,846 per annum, being nearly equal to their territorial revenue. This vast addition to their legitimate income they have been able to acquire from having usurped the franchises of the people. Whether the sum they draw from the public is more or less, it is not our present purpose to investigate. Our object has been to demonstrate that the wealth of the peerage, of which they can justly claim the possession, is insignificant, when compared with the entire wealth of the country; and that the aristocracy, by direct or indirect means, exercising the political power of the state, the government, as at present constituted, neither represents the number, intellect, nor property of the community. The two former propositions have been often demonstrated, but the latter was a desideratum in general information.

There is another mode of viewing the distribution of the revenues of society, which it will, perhaps, not be displeasing to our readers, if we submit to their consideration. The whole social fabric rests upon the industrious orders, and, we believe, they are only imperfectly acquainted with the magnitude of their power and resources. The late Dr. COLQUHOUN, who was a bold, but, as experience has proved, a very shrewd calculator, formed an estimate of the number and income of the different classes into which the community is divided. From the data exhibited by this gentleman, in his "Treatise on the Resources of the British Empire," we have drawn up a statement which will afford a curious insight into the subject about which we are occupied. It is hardly necessary to remark that the Doctor's conjecture of the incomes of the clergy are greatly below the truth. Indeed, it is to be observed that all statistical tables, drawn up prior to the restoration, of a metallic currency, are chiefly useful in showing *proportions*, and do not express the present numerical value of either income or property.

Different Classes of Society, and their respective Incomes.

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONS.	Number of Persons, including their Families and Domestics.	Total Income of each Class.
ROYALTY	300	£ 501,000
NOBILITY	13,620	5,400,000
GENTRY, including baronets, knights, country gentlemen, and others having large incomes.....	402,535	53,022,590
CLERGY:—Eminent clergymen	9,000	1,080,000
Lesser ditto	87,000	3,500,000
Dissenting clergy, including itinerant preachers	20,000	500,000

STATE AND REVENUE, including all persons employed under government	114,500	£ 6,830,000
PENSIONERS, including those of Greenwich, Chelsea, and Kilmainham Hospitals	92,000	1,050,000
LAW:—Judges, barristers, attorneys, clerks, &c.	95,000	7,600,000
PHYSIC:—Physicians, surgeons, apothecaries, &c.	90,000	5,400,000
AGRICULTURE:—Freeholders of the better sort	385,000	19,250,000
Lesser Freeholders	1,050,000	21,000,000
Farmers	1,540,000	33,600,000
TRADE:—Eminent merchants	35,000	9,100,000
Shopkeepers, and tradesmen retailing goods	700,000	28,000,000
Innkeepers and publicans, licensed to sell ale, beer, and spirituous liquors	437,000	8,750,000
WORKING CLASSES:—Agricultural labourers, mechanics, artizans, handicrafts, and all labourers employed in manufactures, mines, and minerals	7,497,531	82,451,547
Paupers, vagrants, gipsies, rogues, vagabonds, and others supported by criminal delinquency	1,548,500	9,871,000

The preceding statement affords room for curious and important inferences. The industrious orders may be compared to the soil, out of which every thing is evolved and produced; the other classes to the trees, tares, weeds, and vegetables, drawing their nutriment, supported and maintained on its surface. Leaving out of consideration the professions of medicine, law, and religion, and the unproductive, or ornamental parts of society, let us attend to the number and incomes of the following order:—

	Numbers.	Incomes.
Freeholders of the better sort	385,000	£19,250,000
Lesser freeholders	1,050,000	21,000,000
Farmers	1,540,000	33,600,000
Eminent merchants	35,000	9,100,000
Shopkeepers	700,000	28,000,000
Innkeepers and publicans	437,000	8,750,000
WORKING CLASSES	7,497,531	82,451,547

These may be considered the active machinery—the solid substratum—upon which the social pyramid is based. When mankind attain a state of greater perfectibility; when vice, crime, and ignorance are more circumscribed; when we shall seldom require physic to cure

diseases, laws to punish offences, or the terrors of superstition to deter from evil; these will be the chief classes in existence. They are the chief classes which ought to exist in a perfect state. The other classes have mostly originated in our vices and ignorance. As mankind become more perfect, or, which is the same thing, as knowledge is more extensively diffused, then will the honorary, legal, medicinal, and ecclesiastical classes disappear: having no employment, their name and office will cease in the social state.

It is from the useful classes the public revenue, for the maintenance of the army, navy, and general government is chiefly extracted. We have before shown the iniquitous principle on which our fiscal regulations have been framed, owing to the political ascendancy of the Aristocracy. Nearly all our taxes are taxes on the ordinary transactions of business, or on the ordinary articles of consumption; and press on the industrious like an inquisitorial and remorseless income-tax, levied without distinction of small or large revenues. It has been the gradual working of this oppressive system that has mainly produced the revolting extremes now observable in the condition of different classes of the community, that has enabled one class to riot in profusion, and the wanton enjoyment of redundant incomes, while others have been steeped in indigence, subjected to unceasing and unrequited toil, and barely able to procure the commonest necessities. That this is not assertion merely, we will demonstrate by an appeal to facts; we will show that the imposts, which constitute almost the entire revenue, are chiefly levied on the property, avocations, and consumption of the working and mercantile orders of the community. The produce of the customs and post-office is usually referred to as an exponent of commercial activity; that of the excise as the index of internal comfort and enjoyment—and for this reason; that the last, which constitutes considerably more than one-third of the public income, is chiefly contributed by the great body of the people.

Statement of the Gross Produce of Taxes in Great Britain for the Year ending 5th January, 1830, chiefly paid by the Industrious Classes.—Annual Finance Accounts.

Windows.....	£1,163,861
Inhabited houses	1,324,427
Bills of exchange	483,965
Receipts	223,639
Fire insurances	773,783
Post-office	2,024,418
Tea	3,321,721
Coffee	485,448
Sugar	5,453,027
Malt	3,834,480
Hops.....	245,024
Beer (ceased Oct. 10th, 1830)	3,110,570
Spirits, British.....	2,036,410
Spirits, Foreign	2,813,768

Licenses	£ 711,829
Soap	1,357,688
Butter	147,997
Cheese	87,190
Corn, grain, meal, and flour	905,204
Eggs	22,189
Tallow	147,085
Tobacco and Snuff	2,245,611
Wines of all sorts.....	1,356,819
Cotton Wool.....	236,843
Coal and Culm carried coastwise.....	888,804

£ 37,972,496

Thus, on a gross revenue of £54,902,199, the sum of £37,972,496 is levied on necessities, and does not in the least touch the luxuries of the great, unless the articles of wines, snuff, and tobacco can be considered such. Except these, all the others are articles of daily use and consumption, and the taxes on them operate like an income-tax, augmenting in the exact ratio of every individual's unavoidable expenditure. This monstrous state of our fiscal system is solely owing to non-representation, and consequent monopoly of political power by the aristocracy, which has enabled them to throw the public burthens on the industrious orders. Those who are the source of the wealth of the community, and who defray the charges of the general government, have no efficient control over its administration; nay, are often not treated with ordinary courtesy, and by an usurping oligarchy considered the inferior orders little better than an ignorant rabble!

“ How various and innumerable
 Are those who live upon the rabble !
 'Tis they maintain the Church and State,
 Employ the priest and magistrate ;
 Bear all the charge of government,
 And pay the public fines and rent ;
 Defray all taxes and excises,
 And impositions of all prices ;
 Bear all the expense of peace and war,
 And pay the pulpit and the bar ;
 Maintain all churches and religions,
 And give their pastors exhibitions !”

VI.—INCREASE OF THE PEERAGE.

The members of the Upper House, succeeding to legislative functions by hereditary right, are exempt from the salutary influence which controls the deliberations of a representative assembly. Their interests are purely oligarchical, and severed from the general interests of the community. It cannot, therefore, excite surprise that any augmentation in a body of exclusives, like this—separated from the mass of society by education, by family pride, by privilege, and usurped power—should be viewed with dislike and apprehension.

Other reasons render an increase in the aristocratic branch of parliament inimical to general feeling. It has been ascertained that the

nobility afford a striking illustration of Mr. MALTHUS's theory of population.* Possessing, in abundance, the comforts and conveniences of life, they are placed in those circumstances most favourable to a full development of the procreative principle, and it is a singular confirmation of the doctrine of the enlightened writer that noble families are actually as prolific as those of the United States of America. Peers are mostly marrying men. After visiting the European capitals, and committing a few follies and eccentricities, they usually settle down at about twenty-five or twenty-eight years of age, and the results, on the average, are a progeny of five children, or about twenty-five per cent. more than other people. The eldest inheriting the estate, the rest would be destitute, were not the parents, by means of their vote and borough-interest, able to quarter them on the public. Hence it is that the people contemplate, with no agreeable feelings, any addition to the peerage; knowing that, in consequence of primogeniture and entail-laws, another family will be thrown upon them for support, and that their own chance of honourable promotion in the army, navy, civil departments, or other branch of national service, is impeded by new rivals, with whom exists no prospect of equitable competition.

Having explained one or two of the popular objections to an increase of the peerage, we shall briefly notice the extraordinary augmentation it has undergone during the reigns of George III. and George IV.

A creation of peers generally takes place on the accession of a new family, the commencement of a new reign, or when an unpopular measure is to be carried. On the death of Elizabeth, the peers only amounted to fifty-six. James, being the first of a new dynasty, raised the number to one hundred and five; and Charles I. to one hundred and thirty-five; Charles II. created fifteen dukes, (six of whom were his natural children,) one marquess, thirty-seven earls, three countesses, two viscounts, and twenty-nine barons. At the Revolution of 1688, William III. to ingratiate himself with the great families, raised eight powerful earls to dukedoms; created eighteen earls, three viscounts, and nine barons. Ann increased the peerage to one hundred and seventy. The accession of the Hanover family rendered new creations necessary: George I. either created or elevated no fewer than forty-nine peers. George II. left one hundred and eighty-four. It is evident that the great increase of the peerage was in the reign of George III. being more than doubled. In 1777 a batch of peers was drafted from the Commons into the Lords, to effect a ministerial majority. This expedient was frequently resorted to by Mr. Pitt. In 1797 ten peers were made. He nearly created the order of marquesses: he made ten marquesses in England where there was but one, and nine in Ireland where there was none—all men eminent, of course, for their *services*. Knighthood was still more profusely lavished. In short, he was as prodigal in wasting the honours of the Crown as the money of the people, and for a similar purpose.

* Edinburgh Review, No. 102, p. 316.

The peers created during the reign of George III. have been classified as follows :—

Landed commoners	46
Irish peers	56
Scotch peers	24
Law	25
State	25
Army	13
Navy	10
Younger sons and younger branches of peers	17
Renewals.....	7
Confirmations	7
Peeresses	5
	<hr/>
	235
Extinctions	74
	<hr/>
Addition	161*
	<hr/>

George IV. added 64 members to the Upper House.† In this number are included individuals who have been raised to the peerage, or in whose favour an abeyance has been terminated, as well as peers of Scotland and Ireland who have obtained English baronies. No notice, however, is taken of Scotch peerages which have been recently restored, nor of the creations of peers of Ireland; of claims to English peerages which have been admitted, nor of elevations of English peerages to higher honours. The average rate at which peers have been created during the last two reigns has been about four per annum; and was the same rate of increase to continue for the next century, it would double the existing number of parliamentary lords.

The total number of individuals who sit in the Upper House is 402, and are as follow :—

Archbishops and bishops	30
Dukes of the royal family	4
Dukes not of the royal family	19
Marquesses	18
Earls	105
Viscounts	22
Barons	160
Scotch and Irish peers.....	44

The title of Duke was first conferred by Edward III.; that of Marquess by Richard II.; and that of Viscount by Henry VI. The last is the only title originally merely honorary, and to which no duties were annexed.

The public looks forward with interest to the approaching discussion in the French Chamber of Deputies of the question of an *hereditary peerage*; and which, it is highly probable, will terminate in the abolition of an institution so repugnant to reason. Because one man is a great lawyer, statesman, or commander, it is no pledge that his

* Quarterly Review, No. 84, p 314.

† Letter to the Duke of Wellington on creating Peers for Life.

lineal descendant will be gifted with the same endowments as those which entitled his progenitor to the exercise of legislative functions. A peerage, or an upper chamber for life, consisting of individuals eminent for wisdom, experience, or national services, might be tolerated; but to make them hereditary, and erect legislators into a *caste*, is quite as preposterous as to make the functions of the astronomer royal hereditary, or the colleges of surgeons and apothecaries. Such manifest irrationalities must speedily disappear from every European government.

VII.—SOURCES OF ARISTOCRATIC MONOPOLY AND ABUSE.

The magnitude of the territorial revenues of the Aristocracy is not such as to be in extreme disproportion with the incomes of many others in a community of great commercial opulence, and forms not the least portion of the original vice of their institution. Whether some noble lords have augmented their rental out of the spoils of the Church and the Crown is a question merely of historical curiosity, and can never be of any practical utility: it is occasionally adverted to as a set-off to oligarchical pride and pretension; beyond which, it has no available application. By the law of England, the quiet possession of an estate for *sixty years* gives a clear and valid title; and we believe there are few noblemen who cannot adduce legal proof of the undisturbed enjoyment of their parks and mansions for a much longer period. So far, then, as the acres are concerned they are perfectly safe; whatever political changes may intervene—and great ones are impending—the legitimate incomes of the peerage can never be endangered, unless they blindly and pertinaciously oppose a regeneration which the wants of the age render indispensable; unless they emulate, in fatuity and crime, CHARLES CAPET and his guilty accomplices.

Aristocratic monopoly and abuse do not result from enormous landed revenues, but from the hereditary rights of legislation, from primogeniture and entail-laws, and from rotten boroughs. None of these, however, are essential constituents of the peerage; only two-thirds of the nobility are entitled, by birth, to seats in parliament; primogeniture and entails are feudals barbarisms void of utility in modern society; and the usurpation of the franchises of the people is such a manifest subversion of constitutional immunities, so inimical to the general freedom and prosperity, that it cannot be defended on any pretext of justice or expediency. Abolish these corruptions and all things will work together for good, without spoliation, without civil convulsion; and the Devonshires, the Lansdownes, and Northumberlands enjoy, undisturbed, their wide spread domains, and retain, without murmur or complaint, their social distinction and supremacy. This we sincerely believe is all the people require; they can have no wish to invade the rights of others, they only wish to recover their own, and this we have no doubt they will speedily accomplish.

The great fount of evil is the rotten boroughs; these are the Pandora's box, from which has flowed national calamities, desolating wars, lavish expenditure, and the monstrous debt and dead weight. They are the

obstacle to every social melloration—civil, commercial, legal, and ecclesiastical. By means of them, the nobility have been enabled to double their private revenues, appropriating to themselves the dignities and livings of the church; pensions and grants out of the public purse; and filling, with their connexions and dependants, every lucrative office in the army, navy, and public administration. There are only two descriptions of offices, namely, those requiring talent and industry, and those the duties of which cannot be discharged by deputy, that the constitution-mongers deny themselves. Unfit for the higher stations in courts of law, they condescend to fill the profitable situations of clerk, registrar, messenger, usher, or receiver, and carry bags and wands at the tails of those whose ability alone has made them their superiors, and to whom they are compelled to pay this homage, as a penalty for their own indolence and incapacity.

In consequence of the boroughs, all our institutions are partial, oppressive, and aristocratic. We have an aristocratic church, an aristocratic bar, an aristocratic game-code, aristocratic taxation, aristocratic corn-laws, aristocratic laws of property; in short, the aristocratic spirit pervades every thing—all is privilege, prescription, monopoly, association, and corporation. Why, it may be asked, is it so,—why does a wealthy, a spirited, and enlightened community not at once rise up and abate the general nuisance? The reason is this—we have also an ARISTOCRATIC PRESS! by this little key-stone is the entire Gothic arch of oppression, usurpation, and imposture upheld.

How has it happened the Aristocracy have been so extremely sulky in regard to the memorable events of last July; that they have kept their purse-strings so tight; that they have kept aloof from all participation in the general exultation? This second national uprising has been attended with no popular massacre, no confiscation, no obtrusion of irreligion; all has been valiant, wise, and moderate—merely a great community rising, with one accord, to defeat an insane attempt to subject it to the yoke of despotism and superstition. Yet they have sent forth no *carmen triumphale* on the sublime occasion. Is it possible that they contemplate, at a distance, the mighty swell which is to submerge their own proud pretensions? If it be so, does it not show that their interests are personal; that they are not in common with the people; that they are merely a corporation in the state, and they feel their corporate immunities imperilled? But what is it which renders them insulated monopolists—strangers in the land? It is not the magnitude of their estates, for they are not objects of popular concern. No; it is not what they rightfully possess, but what they have surreptitiously obtained—the franchises of the people, and the money of the people, which makes them fastidious and apprehensive. Be just and fear not is our advice, and they are still safe!

* * * *An Alphabetical List of the HOUSE OF PEERS, their Pensions, Places, Boroughs, Connexions, and Patronage, will be given in a subsequent and more appropriate part of our Publication.*

STATE

OF THE

REPRESENTATION.

Taxation and representation are inseparable.—*Lord Camden.*

To be taxed without being represented is contrary to the maxims of law and the first principles of the constitution.—*Lord Chatham.*

The people of England have a right to an annual election of their representatives, and an equal representation, founded upon a higher authority than any act or acts of Parliament can confer.—*The late Marquess of Lansdowne's Letter to the People of Wiltshire.*

In a free state, every man who is a free agent ought to be, in some measure, his own governor, and, therefore, a branch, at least, of the representative power should reside in the great body of the people.—*Blackstone, book i. chap. 9.*

That it is a high infringement upon the liberties and privileges of the Commons of Great Britain for any Lord of Parliament, or any Lord-lieutenant of any county, to concern themselves in the election of members to serve for the Commons in Parliament.—*Resolution of the Commons entered on the Journals at the Commencement of every Session.*

That government alone is strong that has the hearts of the people; and will any man contend that we should not be likely to add strength to the state if we were to extend the basis of popular representation? Would not a House of Commons, freely elected, and that was, in truth, the representation of the people, in supporting the administration of the Crown, be more likely to conciliate and to ensure the support of the people? If this be true in the abstract, it is certainly our peculiar duty to look for this support in this hour of difficulty.—*Charles James Fox, 1797.*

No honest man can, according to the present system, continue Minister.—*William Pitt, 1782.*

No person who has an office or place of profit under the King, or who receives a pension from the Crown, should be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons.—*Act of Settlement, 12th and 13th William and Mary, Sect. 7.*

The congregation of hypocrites shall be desolate, and fire shall consume the tabernacles of bribery: they conceive mischief, and bring forth vanity, and their belly prepareth deceit.—*Job, chap. xv. ver. 34 and 35.*

In the puerile debates last session, on the East Retford Bill, Sir Robert Peel took up a sophism dropped by the late Mr. Canning; namely, that, however just and expedient a reform in the representation

might be, still he should oppose it, since it would compromise the safety of the monarchy. What an argument to address to the United Kingdom! Is the safety of the Crown and the Aristocracy to be put in competition with the wishes and welfare of twenty-four millions of people; or, if we include the population of the colonies and dependencies of the empire, with one hundred and fifty millions? The kingly office is only a trust for the public benefit, and the peerage is instituted for a similar purpose; and shall the prerogatives of these be made a pretext for withholding justice and happiness from such an assemblage of human beings? But we deny either the Crown or Peerage would be compromised by parliamentary reform, between which and a government of three orders we cannot discern an inherent incompatibility. Every community must have a head: we prefer a king to any other designation, and between the monarch and the commons an intermediate body may be interposed, without deranging the harmony of the system or erecting a barrier to popular rights. This intermediate body is the Peerage, or Aristocracy, and ought to be a real aristocracy, consisting of the *élite* of society, not deriving their functions from the accident of birth, but chosen, like the judges, for life,—not, indeed, by the Crown, but the representatives of the people. Such innovations as these might compromise the corruptions of monarchy and aristocracy, they might involve a vast reduction in the civil list, and in the pensions and unearned salaries of the nobility; and it may be these Sir Robert contemplated; but the loss of them would not be greatly deplored by the people of England, so long as the substance of the regal office and the legitimate functions of an upper chamber were preserved inviolate.

Having despatched the last new argument against parliamentary reform, we shall proceed at once to the root of all evil—the corrupt and defective state of the national representation.

So much has been urged to show the absurdity and mischievous tendency of the present constitution of the House of Commons, that it seems almost a work of supererogation to add any thing further on the subject. We will, however, by way of introduction to a subsequent analysis of the new assemblage in St. Stephen's Chapel, make a few remarks on three leading positions, on which, we think, the Reformers are unanswerable. These positions are,—first, that the House of Commons, as at present constituted, is unconstitutional and irrational; secondly, that it has been productive of all the calamities under which the country now labours; and, lastly, that it is utterly impossible any great measure of retrenchment, or any other measure materially beneficial to the country, can be carried while it remains unreformed. These points established, every one, not interested in the abuses of government, must see the paramount necessity of renovation; that all other projects are “ shadows vain,” and that this is the only means by which the nuisance of oligarchical usurpation can be abated, and the condition of the people ameliorated.

To prove that the House of Commons is unconstitutional, it is sufficient to revert to the authorities placed at the head of this article. But

it is not only unconstitutional, it is glaringly unequal and preposterous : it is founded on no rational principle of either population, intelligence, or property. There is *Old Sarum*, for instance. Of this borough nothing remains but a thorn-bush, yet it has a nominal bailiff and burgesses, and returns two members to the imperial parliament. Appleby is another burgage tenure-borough : here the right of voting is vested in some pigsties, and it is these magnificent abodes which are represented in the "Great Council of the Nation," while Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, and Birmingham, are excluded. Gatton consists of only six houses, and has but *one voter* ; this voter unites in his own person the various functions of magistrate, churchwarden, surveyor of the highways, collector of taxes, appoints at his court leet the constable, and returns two members to represent him in the Commons' House. At Midhurst there is neither freeholder, property, nor inhabitant ; and the whole business of returning two members is performed by the attorney of Lord Egremont. There would be no end of enumerating similar incongruities ; but these must suffice to show the absurdity of the system in respect of population.

As to *property* it is not less indefensible. At Weymouth and Melcombe Regis, voters possessing only the thirteen hundredth part of a sixpenny freehold have been deemed eligible. At Horsham, voters possessing a house, or part of a house, paying only two-pence a-year, are entitled to vote for a member of parliament. But why, in returning county members, should the elective franchise attach only to freehold property ? Copyhold property, since the abolition of the feudal tenures, is nearly as valuable a possession as freehold. But if property be the proper basis of representation, why not admit funded and personal property ? or why not admit property vested in manufactures, navigation, and shipping ? But the whole is an unanswerable absurdity. The crowning anomaly, however, still remains. ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR PEERS, persons whom we have seen, from one of our mottos, have no right to interfere nor concern themselves in elections, do actually nominate 300 members ; and that 187 more members, forming a majority, are nominated by government, and 123 private individuals.

Absurd as such a system is, the Edinburgh Review and some ingenious persons have attempted its defence. They contend that, notwithstanding its revolting incongruities, it produces much *practical good*, and that men of talent and virtue find their way into the house even under the present defective system. This is the common argument of corruptionists who affect to be rational and liberal, but we will soon show that it is the most weak and puerile imaginable.

Granting that some four or half-dozen honest and clever men obtain seats in the house ; we ask, does this render its constitution as it ought to be ? Is it right that an assemblage, which ought to be a congregation of the wisdom and probity of the community, should only contain about one-hundredth part of men of real ability and good intentions ? Persons of this description ought not to form an extremely small *minority*, they ought to form the *majority* ; nay, the whole ought to be of this

class. Certainly an assemblage where the legislative power resides ought to be composed of men above the average talent and integrity of society; it ought to be a filtration from the mass, and a concentration of all that is eminent in wisdom, integrity, and patriotism.

But of what service are half a dozen, a score, or even a hundred unexceptionable characters in an assembly of more than six hundred? They can neither prevent bad nor carry good measures. Power there is neither in eloquence nor strength of reasoning, but in *strength of voting*; and unless they be superior in the number of votes, as well as in probity and intellect, they can render little service to the country. Unquestionably a few men of ability find their way into parliament through the means of boroughmongers. The fact is, such representative nominees partake of the character of their patrons: if the latter be enlightened and patriotic, so will the former; and *vice versa*. But this only proves the veracity of the representative principle; it only proves that the representative body will always partake of the character of the constituency, whether peers or commoners, and demonstrates, unanswerably, that if the intelligence, property, and a majority of the people were represented so would the public welfare preponderate.

Let us come to the second position—namely, that the *calamities of the country have resulted from non-representation*. Some have been hardy enough to assert that the same measures would have been pursued and the situation of the country would have been nearly similar had the government been vested in the people. They contend that the WAR—the fruitful source of calamity—in its commencement was *popular*. Allowing, for a moment, that the people were favourable to the war at the beginning, and continued so for some time afterward; yet we contend that even this originated in the state of the representation. The voice of reason and truth was stifled by the power of corruption. A panic was raised about property; the most ridiculous fears were excited about French liberty and French principles: Truth could no where make herself heard: all the outlets of information—the daily press, the periodical press, the bar, the pulpit, the senate-house—all were devoted to the Oligarchy: delusion and corruption triumphed; and the friends of liberty and peace, who vainly endeavoured to expose the million of lies which inundated the country, were either banished, imprisoned, or expatriated.

Hence arose the pretended popularity of the revolutionary war. The exclusion of the people from the government afforded to the Church and Aristocracy the means of silencing truth, and deluding and moulding the nation to their own ruinous purposes. On no other supposition is it possible to account for the system so long tolerated in this country; for the accumulation of a debt of 800 millions—the degradation of one-tenth of the community into paupers—the depreciation of the currency—and the growth of a population for which there is neither food nor employment. These evils are not the offspring of a day; they are the bitter fruit of years of misrule; and that the Oligarchy was able to persist in its career, can only be ascribed to its power of delusion, which prevented an energetic

and rational resistance to measures in their commencement, that, on the most obvious principles, contained the seeds of national misery and embarrassment.

We come next to our last position, namely, *without a reform no effective measures of national improvement can be carried*. This is almost a self-evident proposition, and scarcely needs proving. The House of Commons itself is the great grievance of the people, and the interests of a vast majority of its members are directly opposed to the measures by which their sufferings can be alleviated. Their advantages result, like those of the physician, not from the application of speedy remedies, but from the protraction of national disorders. They have usurped the franchises of the community, and profit by its burthens: to restore the former or alleviate the latter would make the honourable members poor indeed. It is notorious that projects of mere economy, introduced even by ministers, and recommended by finance committees, have been often defeated, from their tendency to impoverish the future harvest of spoil. For the House voluntarily to reform itself, would be a sort of *felo de se*; an abandonment of power, patronage, and emoluments; and, though individuals are sometimes virtuous enough to make such sacrifice to the good of their country, public bodies never do.

The only power that will obtain reform is, such a demonstration, on the part of the people, as will render it no longer safe to refuse it. It must be an appeal to the fears, not the justice, of parliament. All arguments against reform have been answered over and over again; and it is now merely a question of PRUDENCE between the oppressor and the oppressed; and we shall be marvellously surprised, if the new parliament long suffer it to remain suspended on this critical alternative:—after the salutary lessons afforded on the Continent—after witnessing the rapidity, the irresistible force with which governments may be regenerated by the intervention of the SOVEREIGN PEOPLE—we shall be greatly surprised at the more than Bourbon infatuation of the “Collective Wisdom of the Nation,” if it does not take warning in time, to avert that terrible punishment which has been so long impending—that *vengeance from without*—by making some extraordinary concessions to popular demands. Their policy, no doubt, will be, to concede as little as possible—to extend the right of voting to the great manufacturing towns—to add a dozen members to an assembly already too numerous by one-third for the purposes of legislation;—such delusive schemes will only add to the mass of contempt and indignation already existing. There must be a real infusion of democratic power; the democracy is now the nation, sufficiently enlightened to exercise its franchises; and it must be represented, otherwise there will be neither peace nor truce.

England has yet to establish her constitution. France and America are the only countries which can answer the challenge—If you have a constitution produce it? An Englishman, if asked, where is the constitution of which you boast? must answer, it exists by a sort of inference from what a half hundred hirelings have written, and in which

they all contradict each other, and are the whole of them contradicted by daily practice in every transaction of state. In every part the renovated French constitution, under king Philip, is an improvement on the principles of the English government. We shall select a few points of comparison.

The French charter is announced as the right of the people, not the grant of the Crown. It abolishes the censorship of the press. The dramatic censorship exists in England in great rigour, and the powers of the attorney-general are an indirect censorship—a suspended despotism—which, aided by the stamp-duties, and the law of securities, completely fetter the freedom of discussion. The sittings of the two chambers are declared public: the debates of our parliament are by law declared secret, and are published only by connivance at the illegality. The French deputies are elected only for five years, ours for seven. A confiscation of goods is abolished;—in England, children may be attainted in blood for the delinquencies of their parents, and punished by confiscation of their father's property. Peers in France cannot vote till they are twenty-five years of age: in England they vote at twenty-one, and by proxy, without hearing the discussion. Half the members must be resident: in England, one-half the members have no knowledge of the boroughs they represent. The French government, without professing to be of any religion, grants not only equal toleration, but equal provision for the maintenance of every Christian sect: the English government adopts one creed, and subjects to neglect and disability every other. In short, the French constitution is, in all respects, what the English pretends to be, except in the impossible theory of three equal and co-existing branches of the legislature. In France, the commons are triumphant, the peers subordinate, and the king only the premier, or first public minister: in England, a surreptitious branch of the constitution is predominant—the boroughmongers.

To all complaints against our defective representation, Mr. Canning had but one reply—*It works well*. Any government is better than no government; and, consequently, they must all work well. It is time, however, for that great Pacific Ocean, the English public, to look about them, and see whether other governments do not work better. While John Bull has been dozing under the political drug, it works well, his more vigilant neighbours in France have laughed him to scorn, and bravely achieved a government that works better. Having compared the principles of the two governments, let us next compare, not theories, charters, and paper-constitutions, but simply the working well; acknowledging, however, *imprimis*, that in *working a people*, no government ever worked half so well as that of England.

Who does not remember the incessant goadings in the house of commons to acknowledge the free republics of South America, and the sophistry, concealments, and shuffling to put off the recognition? The French government, before it was a month old, declared its recognition.

We have been chuckling and rejoicing over Mr. Fox's libel bill for the last forty years. The French have at once determined, that all offences of the press shall be subject to the adjudication of a jury.

What nauseating debates occur every session, to induce the government to rescue the black population of our colonies from a brutal tyranny. The French have already given all the rights and privileges of citizenship to her negroes, and are adopting measures for the effective protection of the African race.

What eloquent and endless declamation there has been on the increasing influence of the Crown, from the increased expenditure, and the augmentation of the Peerage. Within a few days of its first sitting, the French Chamber struck off the roll ninety-three peers of the creation of Charles X. and is pledged to investigate the expediency of retaining at all a hereditary branch of legislature.

Every session produces its exposure of jobs, which generate like the polypus, and are quite as indestructible. The Dundas and Bathurst and the South-American missions were the jobs which amused the Collective this year. The French are subjecting their pension-list, their dead weight, and civil salaries to rigid investigation and close curtailment.

Every session produces scores of motions for economy, finance committees, judicial inquiries, and what not. They all end in nothing but bills of charges for commissioners, secretaries, office-keepers, and so forth. The most ridiculous of all farces, last session, was the mock trial of the East Retford electors and the passing laws to indemnify witnesses for their evidence in proof of corruption!

Ever since 1793 the English Government has been constantly interfering between the people and their rulers, and always against the former. The French have declared their neutrality, and, up to this time, have strictly observed the principle of non-intervention.

Lastly, observe what the French have done in regard to capital punishments. We have been nibbling for half a century at our savage treason laws: last session, an abortive attempt was made to abolish capital punishment for forgery; the French have voted for the abolition of the punishment of death for *all political offences*.

Instead of a working government, the borough system is the laziest institution in the world—a mere congerie of formalities, parade, and ostentation. The Parliament, for a century, has been little better than a common debating club, where a mob of gentlemen meet, during the winter season, to spend their evenings in cracking jokes and spouting nonsense. It has been a game at shuttlecock between the rival disputants, who, in alternately changing from one side of the house to the other, have amused themselves in reciprocally throwing back their opponents' arguments, phrases, and opinions: all the time the nation has been looking on the logomachy quite seriously, as if it were real business, instead of a sham fight—harmless pastime for those who had no better employment.

We remember the late Lord Castlereagh, in the course of one of his astounding orations on the subject of appointing one of those laborious trifles, yeleft a finance committee, observed, in reply to some of the gentlemen opposite, that he had found it an extremely difficult task to fix on "twenty-one *impartial members*" for the undertaking. By

impartial, his lordship evidently meant—only his mode of expression was usually so awkward—*honest* members; that is, those who voted without sinister motives—who did not belong to either of the two great factions into which the House is divided, and who voted on all questions, not with a view to emolument, but the interests of the country. But what a deplorable picture was this of the people's representatives: Sodom and Gomorrah were scarcely less righteous. Out of six hundred and fifty-eight members not twenty-one to be found who did not consider government a mere job, and the public a goose, out of which it was the business of every political knave to pluck a feather!

On the same occasion, his lordship said the Opposition viewed these impartial or honest members with "peculiar acrimony:" this we believe. In truth, there is nothing the Whigs so cordially detest as "*independence of opinion*." The small phalanx in favour of economy which had recently shown itself in the House must have been felt by them as a grievous calamity; it was, in fact, the greatest misfortune that had befallen them since the Revolution. It took away all their cajoleries, all their delusion; they had nothing left for *talk*: and they were reduced to the alternative of either joining those whom they had long held up to public contempt, or of falsifying, by their votes, repeated professions. But still worse for the Opposition: *the entail* was either cut off, or the value greatly diminished: although they had no prospect of immediate possession of office, it is well known they looked forward to a valuable reversion.

Lord Castlereagh observed, the "system of parties," or, more correctly, the system of roguery, had worked well: this, however, we deny. We believe it will be found to have worked like roguish systems generally—to the ruin of *all parties*. How it has worked for the country we may learn from the pressure of public burthens, from the debt, and poor rates: and it is much to us if the working of these fruits of the "*system of parties*" do not ultimately work a suitable punishment to the authors of such heavy calamities.

In an article on the state of the representation, it cannot be out of place briefly to indicate the changes it has undergone from an early period to the present day. Under the Saxons, it has been satisfactorily established that not only the legislative body, but every executive officer, from the tithingman to the elderman, or chief magistrate of a county, was elected by the respective hundreds, annually assembled in the county court. In like manner, all ecclesiastical offices were derived from the people, and the dignities of bishops and abbots conferred by the great council of the nation.* The Commons continued to retain some portion of its ancient power, even under the tyranny of the Norman kings. The Conqueror assembled a parliament in the year 1070, composed of twelve representatives returned out of every county. This parliament confirmed the laws of Edward the Confessor, which the king bound himself to keep, but neglected his engagement. Writs, dated the

* Oldfield's Representative History of Great Britain, vol. i. p. 87.

49th Henry III. summoning knights, citizens, and burgesses to parliament, are still extant. As to the right of suffrage, it appears to have been *general* in all housekeepers paying taxes, or, as it is now termed, scot and lot; this right continued till the disfranchising statute of Henry VI. when the right of voting for the county members was limited to electors possessing freehold property of forty shillings annual value.

In the reign of Edward I. commenced the practice of discontinuing, restoring, and omitting different boroughs in the representation; by which means many large towns and populous places have been deprived of the right of returning members altogether. The following tables, principally extracted from the Appendix to the last volume of Mr. Oldfield's Representative History, will show the changes that have taken place in this respect; also, the number of parliaments held in each reign, and the duration of each parliament.

A List of those Places which formerly sent Members to Parliament and now do not.

Alresford.	Dunstable.	Kidderminster.	Pickering.
Aulton.	Dunster.	Kingston-on-	Raveners.
Axbridge.	Dudley.	Thames.	Ross.
Bamborough.	Doncaster.	Ledford.	South-Molton.
Basingstoke.	Dedington.	Langport.	Sherborne.
Berkhampstead.	Egremont.	Lidbury.	Spalding.
Blandford.	Exmouth.	Leeds.*	Stoke.
Bishops-Stortford.	Ely.	Mere.	Tickhill.
Bradnesham.	Fareham.	Montacute.	Tonbridge.
Bradford.	Farnham.	Manchester.	Teignmouth.
Bromyard.	Fremington.	Melton-Mowbray.	Torrington.
Burford.	Glastonbury.	Medbury.	Wainfleet.
Chelmsford.	Grampound.	Newbury.	Wisbeach.
Conebrig.	Greenwich.	Odyham.	Whitney.
Crediton.	Halifax.	Overton.	Whitby.
Chard.	Highworth.	Poligreen.	Ware.
Chipping-Norton.	Jarvell.	Pershore.	Watchet.

In all, *sixty-nine* boroughs, which sent members to parliament in different reigns, and which are now deprived of that right. Besides these, Mr. Oldfield has given a list of *ninety-seven* other boroughs which have charters, and most probably sent members at some former period since the reign of Edward I. but which are now disfranchised. From the reign of Edward I. to that of Charles II. boroughs have been created and annihilated, at the caprice of each successive monarch. The boroughmongers are ever declaiming on the perils of *change* and *innovation*; in the borough representation there has been *innovation* and *change* with a vengeance; and we may ask the enemies of reform, whether the constitution would receive a greater injury from the crown-clerk forbearing to issue the accustomed bit of parchment, sum-

* Both Leeds and Manchester returned members during the commonwealth, and all the rotten boroughs were omitted in the representation.

moning the relics of Old Sarum, Gatton, and Midhurst, than it has sustained from the disfranchisement of Bradford, Leeds, and Manchester ? It surely becomes necessary to abolish the existing rotten boroughs ; or, according to the argument of our opponents, to make the constitution complete, by either restoring the *one hundred and sixty-five* which have been discontinued, or others in lieu of them.

The following Table shows the Number of Parliaments held in each Reign, from 27th Edward I. A.D. 1299, to the End of the Reign of George IV., showing also the respective length of each Reign.

	No. of Parliaments.	Length of Reign.
Edward I. from 1299,.....	8	8 years.
Edward II.	15	20
Edward III.....	37	50
Richard II.	26	22
Henry IV.....	10	14
Henry V.....	11	9
Henry VI.	22	39
Edward IV.	5	22
Richard III.....	1	2
Henry VII.	8	24
Henry VIII.....	3	38
Edward VI.	2	6
Mary.....	5	5
Elizabeth	10	45
James I.	4	22
Charles I.....	4	24
Charles II.	8	36
James II.	3	4
William III.....	6	13
Anne	6	12
George I.....	2	13
George II.	6	33
George III.....	11	59
George IV.	2	10

From this table it appears that in the 461 years preceding the reign of George III. there were 202 parliaments, whose average duration was $2\frac{1}{2}$ years ; and that in 210 years preceding the reign of Henry VIII. there were 143 parliaments, averaging rather less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ year each. In the 69 years of the reigns of George III. and IV. there were only thirteen parliaments, averaging *five years and one-third* each. Hence we learn how greatly the duration of the same parliament has been extended in these latter days, resulting, no doubt, from the better understanding subsisting between the ministers of the Crown and the representatives of the people, which rendered frequent dissolutions unnecessary.

The following abstracts will show at one view, the gradual alterations in the representation of the people.

SHIRES AND UNIVERSITIES.

		No. of Members.
Edward I. ..	and preceding monarchs, 37 counties	74
Henry VIII.	{ shires of Chester and Monmouth..... 4 }	16
	{ 12 Welsh counties, 1 member each 12 }	
James I.	the two universities	4
Charles II. ..	Durham county	2
Ann	30 Scotch counties, with 1 member each....	30
George III. ..	Irish county members	64
	Irish university	1
George IV. ...	Yorkshire county.....	2
		<hr/> 193

CITIES AND BOROUGHES.

Edward I. ..	{ and preceding monarchs, created 78 boroughs, }	160
	{ with 2 members each, and London with 4 }	
Edward II. ..	created 6 boroughs, with 2 members each	12
Edward III.	{ created 9 boroughs, with 2 members each 18 }	22
	{ restored 2 boroughs, with 2 members each 4 }	
Henry VI. ..	{ created 5 boroughs, with 2 members each 10 }	14
	{ restored 2 boroughs, with 2 members each 4 }	
Edward IV.	{ created 3 boroughs, with 2 members each 6 }	8
	{ restored 1 borough, with 2 members 2 }	
Henry VIII.	{ created 4 boroughs, with 2 members each 8 }	21
	{ created 12 Welsh boroughs 1 member each 12 }	
	{ created 1 borough, with 1 member 1 }	
Edward VI.	{ created 14 boroughs, with 2 members each 28 }	48
	{ restored 10 boroughs, with 2 members each 20 }	
Mary	{ created 7 boroughs, with 2 members each 14 }	21
	{ created 3 boroughs, with 1 member each 3 }	
	{ restored 2 boroughs, with 2 members each 4 }	
Elizabeth ..	{ created 24 boroughs, with 2 members each 48 }	64
	{ restored 8 boroughs, with 2 members each 16 }	
James I.	{ created 3 boroughs, with 2 members each 6 }	23
	{ created 1 borough, with 1 member 1 }	
	{ restored 8 boroughs, with 2 members each 16 }	
Charles I. ..	restored 9 boroughs, with 2 members each	18
Charles II. ..	created 2 boroughs, with 2 members each	4
Ann	added 15 Scots boroughs 1 member each	15
George III. ..	added 35 Irish cities and boroughs	35
		<hr/> 339
		<hr/> 465

As parliamentary reform will and ought to constitute the all-engrossing topic of public interest, we are anxious to lay before our readers all the information which can throw light on the state of the representation. It is particularly desirable to distinguish those places where the elections are *free*, from those which are controlled by aristocratic or individual influence; and also to show the number of voters, and the various, the absurd, and contradictory principles on which the elective franchise is established. The following statement will illustrate these several points, and be convenient for present and future reference. A list of the members returned for the new parliament of the 1 William IV., their salaries, pensions, and political pretensions, will form a separate and subsequent article. The number of voters may not always be correctly given, but, in some instances, we had no means of verifying their accuracy. In some boroughs the number has greatly augmented. Thirty-six years ago, Warwick had 5 or 600 voters, now 1,200: Stafford 400 when Sheridan stood for it, now 860. The number of voters has been doubled in many places, and trebled in Coventry, Leicester, and Preston.

ALPHABETICAL LIST of the Cities and Boroughs in England and Wales, showing the Right of Election, the Number of Electors, and the Names, if any, of the Patrons and Proprietors.

Abingdon, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot and not receiving alms or charity—600.

Agmondesham, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—150.—J. J. Drake, esq.

Albans, (St.) in the mayor, aldermen, and freemen, and such householders as pay scot and lot—400.—Earl of Verulam.

Aldeburgh, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—80.—P. C. Cressigny, esq.

Aldborough, in those persons whose names appear in the court-roll of the manor of Aldborough, as tenants of burgage houses, or the sites of burgage houses, in Boroughbridge, and have been duly admitted thereon, according to the custom of the manor, being resident within the borough—64.—Duke of Newcastle.

Andover, in the bailiff and select number of burgesses only—24.—Earl of Portsmouth and R. Etwall, esq.

Appleby is governed by a mayor, recorder, twelve aldermen, a common council, and two sergeants-at-mace. The right of election is by burgage-tenure—120.—Earl of Lonsdale and Earl of Thanet.

Arundel, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—200.—Duke of Norfolk.

Ashburton, in the freeholders having lands or tenements holden of the borough only; and the freeholders of lands and tenements called Halshanger and Halwell-lands, lying within the borough, and subject to pay borough-rent, have a right to vote—200.—Sir Lawrence Palk, bart.

Aylesbury, the householders of the borough not receiving alms: persons receiving alms, pursuant to the will of Mr. Bedford, disabled from voting, 7th February, 1698. By act of parliament in 1804, the right of election was extended to the freeholders of the three adjoining hundreds—1000.—Marquess of Buckingham and W. Rickford, esq.

Banbury, the mayor, twelve aldermen, and six capital burgesses of Banbury only—18.—Earl of Guildford.

Barnstaple, in the corporation and burgesses—570.

Bath, governed by a mayor, eight aldermen, and twenty-four common-councilmen; the right of election is in the mayor, aldermen, and common

- council only, 27th January, 1706—33.—Marquess of Bath and Charles Palmer, esq.
- Beaumaris*, in the mayor and capital burgesses—24.—Viscount Bulkeley.
- Bedford*, in the burgesses, freemen, and inhabitants, being householders not receiving alms—1400.—Duke of Bedford and Mr. Whitbread.
- Bedwin*, in the freeholders and inhabitants of ancient burgrave-messuages—80.—Marquess of Ailesbury.
- Beeralston*, in the freehold tenants, holding by burgrave-tenure, and paying 3*d.* per annum, or more, ancient-burgrave-rent, to the lord of the borough—70.—Earl of Beverley.
- Berwick*, stated in the Report to be in the freemen of Berwick—700.
- Beverley*, governed by a mayor, a recorder, twelve aldermen, and other officers; and the right of election is in the burgrave-holders—1300.
- Bewdley*, in the bailiff and burgesses appointed by the charter 30 Jac. I. exclusive of all others—13.—W. A. Roberts, esq.
- Bishop's Castle*, in the resident and non-resident capital burgesses, and the common burgesses who have been resident a-year and a day before the day of election, and have a legal settlement in the borough—100.—Earl of Powis.
- Bletchingly*, in the borough holders—90.—Matthew Russell, esq.
- Bodmyn* is governed by a mayor, eleven aldermen, twenty-four common councilmen, and a town-clerk; and the right of election is in the corporation—36.—Marquess of Hertford.
- Boroughbridge*, in the occupiers as tenants from year to year, or for a greater term, of ancient burgrave houses, built upon the sites of ancient burgrave houses, such occupiers being *bona fide* resident, and being or having given notice to be, put upon the court-call of the manor of Aldborough as tenants of such houses—60.—Duke of Newcastle.
- Bossiney*, all who have free land, and live in the parish, are deemed freemen and vote—20.—Lord Wharnccliffe.
- Boston*, in the mayor, aldermen, common council, and freemen resident, paying scot and lot, and claiming their freedom by birth or servitude—500.
- Brackley*, in the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses—33.—Earl of Bridgewater.
- Bramber*, in persons inhabiting ancient houses, or in houses built on ancient foundations, paying scot and lot—20.—Duke of Rutland and Lord Calthorpe.
- Brecon*, in the corporation and free burgesses—600.
- Bridgenorth*, in the corporation and freemen—700.
- Bridgewater*, the inhabitants of the eastern and western divisions of the parish have no right to vote for representatives, but the right of election is in the inhabitants of that division of the parish which is commonly called the Borough, paying scot and lot within the division, and in them only; 14th March 1769—300.—Earl Poulett.
- Bridport*, agreed, in 1762, to be in the inhabitants, being housekeepers, and paying scot and lot—230.
- Bristol*, in the freemen and innholders—5000.
- Buckingham*, in the bailiff and 12 burgesses only.—Marquess of Buckingham.
- Callington*, in the freeholders of houses or lands within the borough, resident or non-resident, and in beneficial leaseholders of entire tenements, consisting of houses or lands within the borough for years, determinable on a life or lives, being resident householders for forty days before the day of election, and rated to the poor at 4*s.* at the least, June 12, 1820—60.—Mathias Atwood and William Thompson, esqrs.
- Calne*, in the ancient burgesses only, and the right of returning burgesses is in the guild-stewards—24.—Marquess of Lansdowne.
- Cambridge*, in the mayor, bailiffs, and freemen, not receiving alms—200.—Duke of Rutland.
- Cambridge, University of*, in the doctors and masters of arts only.
- Camelford* is governed by a mayor, eight burgesses or aldermen, and ten free-

- men, and the right of election is in the corporation—29.—Earl of Darlington.
- Canterbury*, in the freemen, about 1,900 ; 1,070 resident, 830 non-resident.
- Cardiff*, in the burgesses of Cardiff, Aberavon, Cowbridge, Kensigg, Llantrissant, Lougher, Neth, and Swansea—1200.—Marquess of Bute.
- Cardigan*, in the burgesses at large of the boroughs of Cardigan, Aberystwith, Lampeter, and Atpar, only. It was resolved the burgesses of Tregaron have not a right to vote ; 7th May 1730—1,400.
- Carlisle* is governed by a mayor, twelve aldermen, two sheriffs, or bailiffs, twenty-four capital burgesses, or common council-men, in whom is the right of election, as last determined by the House ; March 3, 1791.
- Carmarthen*, in the burgesses possessing a freehold of £4 per annum ; 19th March, 1727—450.—Lord Cawdor.
- Carnarvon*, in the burgesses of Carnarvon, Criccieth, Pulely, Nevin, and Conway—800.—Marquis of Anglesey.
- Castle Rising* is governed by a mayor, and twelve aldermen ; and the right of election is in the free burgesses—40.—Richard Howard, esq.
- Chester*, stated to lie in the freemen ; 2d December, 1690—1,200.—Earl Grosvenor.
- Chichester*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—500.—Duke of Richmond.
- Chippenham*, in the burgesses and freemen, being householders of, and resident in, the ancient burgh houses within the borough ; March 28, 1803—150.—Charles Brooke, esq. and John Maitland, esq.
- Christchurch*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—70.—Sir George Henry Rose.
- Cirencester*, in all the inhabitants, being householders. The inmates were excluded ; 4th November, 1690. As also were the inhabitants of the Abbey, the Emery, and the Spiringate-lane ; 8th December, 1709—600.—Earl Bathurst.
- Clithero*, in such freeholders only, as, according to the resolution of 16th July, 1660, are described to be free-burghers, seised on life, or in fee of burgh lands or houses there—102.—Viscount Curzon and Lord Ribblesdale.
- Cockermouth* is governed by a bailiff, chosen yearly, by a jury of sixteen burghers, at the court-leet of the manor ; and the right of election is in the burgh tenure—200.—Earl of Lonsdale.
- Colchester*, agreed to be in the mayor, aldermen, common council, and free burgesses, not receiving alms ; 6th May, 1714.—N. B. The right of making foreigners (not having a right of freedom) freemen, is in the mayor and free burgesses in common council assembled—1,500.
- Corffecastle*, agreed to be in such persons as are seised in fee, in possession or reversion, of any messuage, tenement, or corporeal hereditament, within this borough ; and in such persons as are tenants for life or lives ; and, for want of such freehold, in tenants for years, determinable on any life or lives, paying scot and lot, and in no others ; January 2, 1719—50.—Henry Bankes, esq.
- Coventry*, in such persons as have served seven years' apprenticeship within the city to one and the same trade, not receiving alms ; 1st March, 1708. But persons receiving the sacrament or bread-money, Sir Thomas White's, or Sir Thomas Wheatley's gifts, were not then disqualified. Members of the Fullers' Company being freemen, not receiving alms or weekly charity, and freemen who have served seven years' apprenticeship in the city or suburbs, not receiving alms or weekly charity, have a right to vote ; 13th March, 1711. In such freemen as have served seven years' apprenticeship to one and the same trade in the city or suburbs, and do not receive alms or weekly charity, such freemen being duly sworn and enrolled ; 20th November, 1722—2,400.
- Cricklade*, agreed to be in the freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders, for three years ; 10th June, 1685. Agreed to be in freeholders and copyholders of the borough houses, and leaseholders for any term not under three years, only ; 1st April, 1684. The committee reported that it was agreed to be

in the freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders, for not less than three years; 20th February, 1695. By act of parliament in 1782, the right of election extended to the freeholders of the hundreds in common with the voters of the borough—1,500.

Clifton, Dartmouth, Hardness, in the freemen of the borough—100.—The Treasury.

Denbigh, in the free burgesses of Denbigh Leon, alias Holt and Ruthyn—500.—Hon. F. West.

Derby is governed by a mayor, high steward, nine aldermen, a recorder, town clerk, fourteen brethren, and fourteen common councilmen. The right of election is in the corporation, freemen, and sworn burgesses—700.—Duke of Devonshire and Edward Coke, esq.

Devizes, in the mayor and select number of burgesses only—306.—Joshua Smith, esq.

Dorchester, in the inhabitants paying to church and poor in respect of their personal estates, and in such persons as pay to church and poor in respect of their real estates within the said borough, though not inhabitants or occupiers, and although their names do not appear upon the poor-rates; 14th April, 1791—200.—Earl of Shaftesbury.

Dover, in the non-inhabitant freemen, as well as the inhabitant freemen—2,000; resident 1,200, non-resident 800.—The Treasury, one member.

Downton, the right of election is in the burgage-holders—80.—Earl of Radnor.

Droitwich, in the burgesses of the corporation of Saltsprings, of Droitwich—15.—Lord Foley.

Dunwich, in the freemen inhabiting within the borough, not receiving alms—40.—Lord Huntingfield and Snowden Barne, esq.

Durham, in the corporation and freemen—1,000.

Eastloe, in the mayor, burgesses, and freemen—46.—Sir Edward Buller, bart.
Edmundsbury, (St.) in one alderman, twelve burgesses, and twenty-four common councilmen.—Duke of Grafton.

Eresham, in the common burgesses—700.

Exeter, in the freeholders and freemen; 14th June, 1660—1,500.

Eye, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—100.—C. Kerrison, esq.

Flint, in the inhabitants of the boroughs of Flint, Rhydlan, Overton, Caerwys, and Caergurley, paying scot and lot—100.

Fowey, in the tenants of the crown, who are capable of being portreeves, and such of the inhabitants only as pay scot and lot; 5th May, 1701. That the persons entitled to elect the portreeve of the borough of Fowey are those who are capable of holding that office; that is, such crown tenants only as have been duly admitted on the court-rolls of the manor of the borough, and have done their fealty; and such persons only are duly admitted, whose lands, being freehold, were anciently, and continue to be, held immediately of the Duke of Cornwall, as parcel of his said manor of the borough, and whose titles to those lands have been presented at a court-baron by a sworn homage or jury of the freeholders of the said manor; 21st March, 1792—120.—Earl of Mount Edgemcombe and Philip Rashleigh, esq.

Gatton, in the freeholders and inhabitants paying scot and lot—1.—Sir Mark Wood, bart.

Germain's, (St.) in the freemen—50.—Earl of St. Germain's.

Gloucester, in the freemen—2,200.

Grantham, in the freemen, not receiving alms or charity—900.—Earl Brownlow.

Great Grimsby, in the freemen admitted at a full court by the mayor, aldermen, common councilmen, and burgesses, such freemen being resident, and paying scot and lot in all cases except where no rate has taken place subsequent to their admission—500.—Lord Yarborough.

East Grinstead, in the burgage-holders only, and not in the burgage-holders and inhabitants; 9th Feb. 1695—36.—Duchess of Dorset.

Guildford, only in the freemen and freeholders paying scot and lot, resident in the town; 24th April, 1689. It was agreed that one who had served seven years to a freeman was, *ipso facto*, a freeman; 3d Feb. 1710—240.—Earl of Onslow.

Harwich, in the mayor, aldermen, and capital burgesses, or head-boroughs, resident within the borough—32.—The Treasury.

Haslemere, in the freeholders resident within the borough; 9th Feb. 1698. By the word *freeholders* is meant only freeholders of messuages, lands, or tenements, lying within the borough and manor of Haslemere, whether the same pay rent to the lord of the said borough and manor or not, exclusive of any lands or tenements which are, or have been, parcel of the waste ground of the said borough and manor, or any messuages or buildings which are, or shall be, standing thereon; 25th April, 1755—60.—Earl of Lonsdale.

Hastings, in the mayor, jurats, and freemen resident, and not receiving alms—200.—Edward Milward, esq.

Haverfordwest agreed to be in the freeholders, burgesses, and inhabitants paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms; 4th July, 1714—500.—Lord Kensington.

Helston, in the mayor, four aldermen, and thirty-one freemen—36.—Duke of Leeds.

Hereford, in the citizens and freemen—1,200.

Hertford, in the inhabitants not receiving alms, and in such freemen only as, at the time of their being made free, were inhabitants of the borough, or the parishes thereof; the number of freemen living out of the borough not exceeding three persons; 5th Dec. 1705—700.

Heydon, in the burgesses; 3d April, 1746—150.—L. Iveson, esq.

Heytesbury, in the burgrave-holders—50.—Duke of Marlborough and Lord Heytesbury.

Higham Ferrars, in the mayor, aldermen, burgesses, and freemen, being householders, and not receiving alms—140.—Earl Fitzwilliam.

Hindon, in the inhabitants of houses within the borough, being housekeepers and parishioners, not receiving alms.—William Beckford, esq.

Honiton, in the inhabitant-housekeepers, called potwallers, not receiving alms; 18th Dec. 1724—450.

Horsham, in all such persons as have an estate of inheritance, or for life, in burgrave-houses, or burgrave-lands, lying within the borough—25.—Duke of Norfolk.

Huntingdon, in the freemen and inhabitants—200.—Duke of Manchester and Earl of Sandwich.

Hythe, in the mayor, jurats, common council, and freemen; 27th January, 1710—343. Resident 26, non-resident 317.—The Treasury, one member.

Ilchester, in the bailiff, capital burgesses, and inhabitants not receiving alms; 28th January, 1702—155.—Lord Huntingtower.

Ipswich, in the bailiff, portmen, commonalty, and freemen, not receiving alms. A resolution passed, that portmen are an essential constituent part of the great court for making freemen, without some of which portmen being present, the court cannot be held; 31st March, 1714—800.

St. Ives, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot; 8th December, 1702—300.—Hon. William-Pole-Tilney-Long Wellesley.

King's Lynn, in the freemen—300.—Earl of Orford.

Kingston-upon-Hull, in the burgesses and freemen—2,020.

Knaresborough, in the burgrave-holders—88.—Duke of Devonshire.

Lancaster, in the freemen and inhabitants—2,220.

Launceston, in the mayor, aldermen, and freemen, being inhabitants at the time they were made free, and not receiving pay of the parish; the aldermen to be elected out of the legal freemen.—Duke of Northumberland.

Leicester, in the freemen not receiving alms, and in the inhabitants paying scot and lot; but persons living in the borough by certificate, not having gained

- a settlement by renting £10 *per annum*, or serving in an annual office, are not entitled (by paying scot and lot) to vote—1,600.
- Leominster**, in the bailiffs, capital burgesses, and inhabitants, paying scot and lot—600.
- Leskeard**, in the mayor and burgesses—100.—Earl of St. Germain.
- Lewes**, in the inhabitants, being householders, paying scot and lot—400.
- Lincoln**, in the citizens and freemen—1,400.
- Lostwithiel**, in the mayor and six capital burgesses, together with the seventeen assistants annually chosen, and who had a right to vote at the preceding election of a mayor; 20th December, 1709—25.—Earl of Mount Edgumbe.
- Lyme Regis**, in the mayor, capital burgesses, and freemen—50.—Earl of Westmorland.
- Lichfield**, in the bailiffs, magistrates, freeholders of 40s. *per annum*, and all that hold by burgage tenure; and in such freemen only as are enrolled, paying scot and lot—600.—Marquess of Stafford and Viscount Anson.
- Liverpool**, admitted to be in the mayor, bailiffs, and freemen, not receiving alms; 5th March, 1729—5,000.
- London**, in the livery; act of 1725—14,000.
- Ludlow**, in the resident common burgesses, as well as the twelve and twenty-five; 26th February, 1661. It was resolved that the sons of burgesses of Ludlow, and those that marry the daughters of burgesses, have a right to be made burgesses; and that every person having a right to be made a burgess ought to demand the same by petition, signed by the petitioner, according to the by-law in 1669, and not otherwise—500.—Earl of Powis.
- Ludgershall**, in such persons as have any estate of inheritance or freehold, or leasehold determinable upon life or lives, within the borough, not confined to entire ancient houses, or the scites of ancient houses within the borough; 15th April, 1791—60.—Sir James Graham, bart. and J. H. Everett, esq.
- Lymington**, in the mayor and burgesses only—70.—Sir Harry Neale, bart.
- Maidstone**, in the freemen not receiving alms or charity—about 840. Resident 500, non-resident 340.
- Malden**, in such freemen as do not receive alms, and are entitled to freedom by birth, marriage, or servitude; and that persons deriving their right of freedom from honorary freemen, and persons claiming their freedom by purchase, and exercising trades within the borough, have no right to vote; 20th May, 1715—1,600.
- Malmesbury**, in the aldermen and twelve capital burgesses—15.—Joseph Pitt, esq.
- Malton**, in the inhabitants rated to church and poor—400.—Earl Fitzwilliam.
- Marlborough**, in the mayor and burgesses only; 13th May, 1717—24.—Marquess of Ailesbury.
- Great Marlow**, in the inhabitants only who pay scot and lot; 21st Nov. 1690—240.—Owen Williams, esq.
- Mawes**, (St.) in the mayor and resident burgesses—46.—Marquess of Buckingham.
- Midshall or St. Michael**, in the portreeve, and lords of the manor who are capable of being portreeves, and the inhabitants paying scot and lot—26.—Sir Christopher Hawkins, bart.
- Midhurst**, in the burgage-holders—100.—Lord Carrington.
- Milbourne-Port**, in the capital bailiffs and their deputies, in the commonalty, stewards, and the inhabitants paying scot and lot—100.—Marquess of Anglesey.
- Minehead**, in the parishioners of Minehead and Dunster, being housekeepers in the borough of Minehead, and not receiving alms—160.—Viscount Falmouth and Sir Christopher Hawkins, bart.
- Monmouth**, in the burgesses and inhabitants of Monmouth and the inhabitants of the borough of Newport and Aske—800.—Duke of Beaufort.
- Montgomery**, in the burgesses of the town only—84.—Earl of Powis.
- Morpeth**, in the bailiffs and free burgesses of the borough—200.—Earl of Carlisle.

- Newark*, in the mayor, aldermen, and the inhabitants paying scot and lot within the borough—800.—Duke of Newcastle and Lord Middleton.
- Newcastle-under-Line*, in the mayor, bailiffs, common council, and resident freemen—650.—Marquess of Stafford.
- Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, in the corporation and free burgesses—2,500.
- Newport*, two vianders, with inhabitants paying scot and lot—62.—Duke of Northumberland.
- Newport*, the mayor, 11 aldermen, and 12 burgesses; in all 24.—Sir Leonard T. W. Holmes, bart.
- Newtown*, in the freemen or burgesses seised of a corporeal estate of freehold in any house, building, or lands, within the borough, of the value of 40s. a-year, and upwards—36.—Thomas Leigh, esq.
- Newtown*, in the mayor and burgesses having borough lands within the borough—39.—Sir Leonard T. W. Holmes, bart.
- Northallerton*, in the burgage-holders—180.—Earl of Harewood and Henry Peirse, esq.
- Northampton*, in the inhabitants being householders, and not receiving alms; and the sharing in the charitable gift, distributed at Christmas, is a taking of alms; 26th April, 1665—1,200.
- Norwich*, in the freeholders, and such freemen only as are entered in the books, and do not receive alms or charity; 12th March, 1701—3,500.
- Nottingham*, in the mayor, freemen, and freeholders of 40s. per annum—4,050.
- Oakhampton*, in the freeholders and freemen, being made free according to the charter and bye-laws of the borough; 24th February, 1710—400.—Albany Savile, esq.
- Orford*, in the mayor, portmen, capital burgesses, and freemen, not receiving alms—80.—Marquess of Hertford.
- Oxford*, in the freemen.—Duke of Marlborough.
- Oxford*, in the doctors and actual masters. Returning officer, the Vice-Chancellor of the University.
- Pembroke*, in the mayor, bailiffs, and burgesses of the several boroughs of Pembroke, Tenby, and Whiston; 23d February, 1711—500.
- Penryn*, in the mayor, portreeve, aldermen, and inhabitants paying scot and lot—380.—Lord de Dunstanville.
- Peterborough*, in the inhabitants within the precincts of the minster, being householders not receiving alms, and in the other inhabitants, within the city, paying scot and lot—431.—Earl Fitzwilliam.
- Petersfield*, in the freeholders of lands, or ancient dwelling-houses or shambles, or dwelling-houses or shambles built upon ancient foundations, within the borough, such lands and dwelling-houses being entire ancient tenements, June 16, 1820; May 30, 1821—100.—Sir Hylton Jolliffe, bart.
- Pontefract*. Resolved, by the House, that the right of election is in the inhabitant householders resident there; May 28, 1624. In the persons having, within the borough, a freehold burgage-tenure rent; February 5, 1770; April 11, 1783; June 11, 1784; March 9, 1791—500.
- Plympton*, in the mayor, bailiff, and freemen, and in the sons of freemen who have a right to demand their freedom; 28th January, 1702—200.—Earl of Mount Edgumbe.
- Plymouth*, in the mayor and commonalty; 9th June, 1660—500.—Resolved, that the word *commonalty* extends only to the freemen of the borough; 17th January, 1739.—The Treasury.
- Poole*, in out-burgesses as well as in the in-burgesses—100.
- Portsmouth*, in the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses only; May 16, 1821—120.
- Preston*, in all the inhabitants; 18th December, 1661. It was determined that the words, *all the inhabitants*, did not mean only the in-burgesses of the last guild, or those admitted since by copy of court-roll, as are inhabitants of the said place, but all the inhabitants at large; 29th Nov. 1768—5510.
- Queenborough*, in the mayor, jurats, and bailiffs—180.—The Ordnance and the Admiralty.

- New Radnor*, in the burgesses of Radnor, Ryader, Knighton, Knuckeas, and Kevenlice—1200.
- Reading*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot; 30th May, 1716—1100.
- East Retford*. By an act of last session, 1 Will. IV. c. 74, the right of election for this borough is extended to the freeholders of the hundred of Bassetlaw; that is, to the dependents of the Duke of Newcastle.
- Richmond*, in such persons only as are owners of ancient burgages in the borough, having a right of pasture in a common field, called Whitcliff Pasture; 9th March, 1727—280.—Lord Dundas.
- Ripon*, in the burgrave holders—190.—Mrs. Lawrence.
- Rochester*, in all freemen, not receiving alms or charity—about 800. Resident 450, non-resident 350.—The Admiralty one member.
- New Romney*, in the mayor, eight jurats, and sixteen freemen—25.—Sir Edward Dering, bart.
- Rye*, in the mayor, jurats, and freemen, inhabiting the port, and paying scot and lot—100.—T. P. Lambe, Esq.
- Ryegate*, in the freeholders—200.—Earl of Hardwick and Lord Somers.
- Saltash*, in the mayor and free burgesses, being members of the corporation—36.—John Buller, Esq.
- Sandwich*, in the freemen resident and non-resident, except those who receive alms, 900; about an equal number resident and non-resident.—The Admiralty one member.
- New Sarum*, in the select number, *i. e.* the mayor and corporation, consisting of 56 persons.—Earl of Radnor.
- Old Sarum*, in the freeholders, being burgrave-holders of the borough—7.—Earl of Caledon.
- Scarborough*, governed by two bailiffs, two coroners, four chamberlains, and thirty-six burgesses, in whom is the right of election—44.—Duke of Rutland and the Earl of Mulgrave.
- Seaford*, in the inhabitant housekeepers of the town and port, paying scot and lot—50.—Sir John Leach and Charles Rose Ellis, Esq.
- Shaftesbury*, in the mayor and burgesses and the inhabitants paying scot and lot—300.—John Dyneley, Esq.
- Shoreham, New*. The right of election was formerly in the inhabitants, paying scot and lot; but an act of parliament passed, in 1771, whereby it is declared that all the freeholders of 40*s. per annum*, in the rape or hundred of Bramber, in which Shoreham is situated, have a right to vote—1500.—Duke of Norfolk.
- Shrewsbury*, in the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses. Several parishes and villages were voted to be no part of the ancient borough or suburbs; 9th April, 1723—500.
- Southampton*, in the burgesses and inhabitants; 31st December, 1689. Resolved, that the out-living burgesses as well as the burgesses (inhabitants) paying scot and lot, had a right to vote; 17th March, 1695. Mayor and bailiffs are the returning officers; April 3, 1735—800.
- Southwark, Borough of*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot; 10th November, 1702—3500.
- Stafford*, in the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses resident within the borough—860.
- Stamford*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms or public charities—500.—Marquess of Exeter.
- Steyning*, in the constable and householders, inhabitants within the borough, paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms—80.
- Stockbridge*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—110.—J. F. Barham, Esq.
- Sudbury*, in the sons of freemen born after their fathers were made free, and in such as have served seven years' apprenticeship, or made freemen by redemption; 6th December, 1703—850.
- Tamworth*, in the inhabitants, paying scot and lot, and in such persons as have freeholds within the borough, whether resident within the borough or not;

- 17th March, 1698. In the inhabitants, being householders, paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms; 23d Jan. 1722—250.—Sir Robert Peel, bart.
- Tavistock*, the freeholders of inheritance in possession, inhabiting within the borough—115.
- Taunton*, in the inhabitants within the borough, being potwallers, and not receiving alms or charity—550.
- Tewkesbury*, in the freemen at large, and in all persons seised of an estate of freehold in an entered dwelling-house within the ancient limits of the borough—500.
- Thetford*, in the mayor, burgesses (which are ten), and in the commonalty or common council (which are twenty), amounting in the whole to thirty-one—31.—Duke of Grafton.
- Thirske*, in the burgrave-holders of Old Thirske—50.—Sir Thomas Frankland, bart.
- Tiverton*, in the mayor, recorder, burgesses, and assistants—26.—Earl of Harrowby.
- Totness*, in the freemen not inhabiting, as well as freemen inhabiting, within the borough—80.
- Tregony*, in all the inhabitants that provide for themselves, whether they live under the same roof or not; 5th March 1695—100.—Earl of Darlington.
- Truro*, in the mayor, and select number of burgesses—26.—Viscount Falmouth.
- Wallingford*, in the mayor, aldermen, bailiffs, and eighteen assistants, together with the inhabitants paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms—150.
- Wareham*, in the mayor and magistrates paying scot and lot, and in the freeholders of lands or tenements there, who have been, *bona fide*, to their own use, in the actual occupation, or in the receipts of the rents and profits of such lands or tenements for the space of one whole year next before the election, except the same came to such freeholders by descent, devise, marriage, marriage-settlement, or promotion to some benefice in the church; 19th Jan. 1747—150.—John Calcraft, esq.
- Warwick*, in the commonalty of the said town, 31st May, 1628; in such persons only as pay to church and poor in the borough, 23d Jan. 1722. confirmed to be in such as pay to church and poor, 18th Feb. 1793—1200.—Earl of Warwick.
- Wells*, in the mayor, masters, and burgesses, and in such persons as are (by consent of the mayor and common council) admitted to their freedom, in any of the seven trading companies, on account of birth, servitude, or marriage—500.—Clement Tudway, esq.
- Wendover*, in the inhabitant housekeepers within the borough not receiving alms; but persons coming by certificate to live in the borough have not a right to vote; 21st Nov. 1702—140.—Lord Carrington.
- Wenlock*, in the burgesses—300.—Earl of Bradford and Cecil Forester, esq.
- Weobly*, agreed to be in the inhabitants of houses of 20*s. per annum*, paying scot and lot, 13th January, 1698. Resolved to be in the inhabitants of the ancient vote-houses of 20*s. per annum* value, and upwards, residing in the said houses forty days before the day of election, and paying scot and lot; and also in the owners of such ancient vote-houses, paying scot and lot, as shall be resident in such houses at the time of the election; 3d March, 1736—85.—Marquess of Bath.
- Westbury*, in every tenant of any burgrave tenement in fee, for life, or ninety-nine years, determinable upon lives, or by copy of court-roll, paying a burgrave-rent of 4*d.* or 2*d.* yearly, being resident in the borough, and not receiving alms; 1st June, 1715—50.—Sir M. M. Lopes, bart.
- Westlooe*, in the mayor, aldermen, burgesses, and freemen—70.—John Buller, esq.
- Westminster, City of*, that the right of election for the city and liberty of Westminster is in the inhabitant householders, paying scot and lot, of the united

- parishes of St. Margaret and St. John, and of the several parishes of St. Paul Covent-garden, St. Anne, St. James, St. George, Hanover-square, St. Martin-in-the-Fields, St. Clement Danes, and St. Mary-le-Strand, (including so much and such parts of the said parishes of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, St. Clement Danes, and St. Mary-le-Strand, as are within the liberties, district, limits, or jurisdiction, of the Duchy of Lancaster,) and of the liberty or district of St. Martin-le-Grand, in the county of Middlesex, and of the precinct of the Savoy; March 19, 1795—14,000.
- Weymouth and Melcombe Regis*, united by Elizabeth into one corporation, though two boroughs; and send four Members. Agreed to be in the mayor, aldermen, bailiffs, and capital burgesses, inhabiting in the borough, and in persons seised of freeholds within the borough, and not receiving alms; 7th May, 1730—500.—Sir G. F. Johnstone.
- Whitchurch*, in the freeholders only of lands or tenements, in right of themselves or their wives, not split since the act of the 7th and 8th years of the reign of King William; 21st December, 1708—70.—Viscount Sydney and Viscount Middleton.
- Wigan*, in the free burgesses.—Sir Robert Holt Leigh and John Hodson, esq.
- Wilton*, in the mayor and burgesses, who are to do all corporate acts, and receive the sacrament; 17th March, 1710—80.—Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.
- Winchelsea*, in the mayor, jurats, and freemen—40.—Earl of Darlington.
- Winchester*, in the mayor, recorder, aldermen, bailiffs, and corporation—120.—Sir H. P. St. John Mildmay.
- Windsor*, in the mayor, bailiffs, and select number of burgesses only; 2d May, 1689. Is not in the mayor, bailiffs, and burgesses, but all the inhabitants have the right of electing; 5th April, 1697—430.—The Treasury.
- Woodstock*, in the mayor, aldermen, and freemen of the borough—400.—Duke of Marlborough.
- Worcester*, agreed to be in the freemen not receiving alms: 7th February, 1693. In the citizens not receiving alms, and admitted to their freedom by birth or servitude, or by redemption, in order to trade within the city; 11th February, 1747—2500.
- Wootton-Basset*, in the inhabitants paying scot and lot—150.—Earl of Clarendon and Viscount Bolingbroke.
- Chipping-Wycombe*, in the mayor, bailiffs, and burgesses, not receiving alms—170.—Sir J. D. King, bart. and Sir Thomas Baring, bart.
- Yarmouth, Great*, in the burgesses at large—730.—The Treasury.
- Yarmouth*, in the twelve aldermen and one burgess—Sir L. T. W. Holmes, bart.
- York*, in the corporation and citizens—3000.

It is unnecessary to give any account of the representation of Scotland, since it is notoriously little more than one great rotten borough, over which the Treasury has a controlling influence. The late Lord Melville always boasted that he could return *thirty-nine* out of *forty-five*, who represented the entire kingdom of Scotland! The Duke of Montrose is now considered the patron-general, for the Treasury, of Scotland.

In Ireland, the spirit-stirring exertions of Mr. O'Connell; the disfranchisement, in 1829, of the 40s. freeholders; and the limitation of the qualification to vote for county members to those possessed of a clear yearly freehold of £10 per annum, have introduced changes in the exercise of the elective franchise, and the disposition of parliamentary patronage, which cannot yet be definitively ascertained. Before the Disfranchisement Act, the small freeholders could be created at pleasure,

and were entirely under the influence of their landlords; the county voters are now under the influence of the priesthood and the "Great Agitator." From the results of the general election, it would appear the Duke of Wellington was correct in his anticipation that the change of the elective eligibility for shires would destroy the influence of the great landowners over the returns. In nearly all the contests this year, they have been defeated, or, as in the case of the Beresfords at Waterford, compelled to enter into compromises little less mortifying than defeat itself. With the loss of their power, it is to be hoped they will lose a part of their government patronage. Formerly, a county member, if he supported the ministers, or if he were in opposition to the ministers' opponent, had what is called "*the patronage of the county*," that is, he appointed excise and custom-house officers, officers of militia, &c. Possessed of this influence, the claims upon his friendship were numerous; and as long as any thing remained to be given away, he dealt out his favours to the gentlemen who brought their voters to support him on the day of trial. These latter men, forming another link in the chain of political corruption, distributed their favours to their tenants who had made the greatest number of freeholders on their estates.

In the Irish peerage, there has been no reform; and they, at least, continue to be returned on the old corrupt and slavish principles. They are virtually nominated by ministers. When a peer dies, government intimate, through the Irish secretary, by whom they wish the vacancy to be supplied; this invariably procures the election of the desired person. So much for the independence attached to rank and property!

We shall conclude our account of the representation by inserting two statements: the first exhibits the proportion in which the members are returned for the different sections of the United Kingdom; the second is a brief recapitulation of parliamentary patronage, and, at once, shows the description of persons and interests *virtually* represented in the Collective Wisdom of the Nation. The statement for Ireland will require some allowance, from the causes already mentioned.

Members returned for the different Sections of the United Kingdom:

The county of Cornwall, 42; of Wilts, 34; of York, 32	108
Sussex, 28; Dorset, 30; Suffolk, 16; Stafford, 10		74
The counties of Devon and Hants, each	26 52
Kent and Somerset, each	18 36
Bucks, Lancaster, and Surrey, each	14 42
Lincoln, Norfolk, and Salop, each	12 36
Berks, Northampton, Oxford, and Worcester, } each	9 36
Essex, Gloucester, Hereford, Middlesex, Northumberland, and Nottingham, } each	8 48

The counties of Cambridge, Cumberland, Hertford, and Warwick,	} each 6	24
Bedford, Chester, Derby, Durham, Huntingdon, Leicester, and Westmorland,		
Monmouth, 3; Rutland 2	each 4	28
Wales, 24; Scotland, 45; Ireland, 100		5
		169
Making the total number of members		658

PARLIAMENTARY PATRONAGE.

Members returned by 87 peers in England and Wales	218
21 peers in Scotland	31
36 peers in Ireland	51
Total returned by peers	300
Members returned by 90 commoners in England and Wales .	137
14 commoners in Scotland	14
19 commoners in Ireland	20
Members nominated by government	16
Total returned by commoners and government ..	187
Total returned by nomination	487
Independent of nomination	171
Total of the House of Commons	658

PROSPECTS OF REFORM IN THE REPRESENTATION.

The great popular movements among our neighbours cannot fail to have some influence on the approaching deliberations of the Borough-mongers, and incline them to listen to propositions which, prior to the warning events on the continent, they would have repelled with sovereign disdain. The results of the general election show that the side of mere bigotry and oppression has received no augmentation of force: Mr. Brougham's return for Yorkshire and Mr. Hume's for Middlesex are events of interest, by demonstrating not only a decline in aristocratic ascendancy, but also the progress of political information among those classes which have heretofore been in great part impassable, and kept aloof from popular influence. It would, however, be a fatal error to suppose the Oligarchy are about to abandon their usurpations. Of this we see not the slightest indication. When the beer-monopoly was about being dissolved, the prices of public-houses fell enormously; but we have not heard of any fall in the *market price of boroughs*. Till then—till this infallible sign appears—our readers may rely upon it there is no measure in contemplation likely to be productive of substantial benefit to the community.

The fact is—and we are anxious to impress it—the new parliament will be precisely of the same impress as the old, for the essential purposes of constitutional regeneration. Retrenchment, to a certain extent, we shall have, and perhaps some delusive and inefficient project of parliamentary reform—perhaps a committee to inquire into the *state of the representation*. God preserve us, we say, from any parliamentary committees of inquiry! What, indeed, is there to inquire about? Shall we inquire if the sun shines, or the moon gives light? The abuse is notorious, the mode of reforming it is notorious; then let us have it without delay. Are not the motions of Mr. Maddox and the practices of Quintin Dick on indelible record? No one doubts that certain peers send two, three, five, and seven members to parliament, and that they have no right to send one. Abolish the injustice without hesitation. The people would be mad—madder a great deal than the DUKE, when he became premier—were they to suffer procrastination on a subject like this; were they to suffer parliamentary reform to be inquired about and debated on for half a century, like the abolition of negro slavery and catholic emancipation. This is not the *spirit of the age*; the question is ripe for decision, and the people will never suffer it to be nursed, like a suit in chancery, for the benefit of lawyers and place-hunters. Our oppressors have an obvious interest in delay; for them government can never be better constituted than it is, and their best policy is to concede as *little*, and as *slowly* as possible—always excepting the risk they run, by such a course, of having the *whole* of their ill-gotten acquisitions wrested from them; whereas, by timely sacrifice of a part, they might enjoy the remainder in peace and security.

The new House of Commons, we repeat, will be like its predecessors. It has been elected under the influence of the same partial interests and the same prejudices; and, the seed being the same, so will the fruit. The church, the army, the bar, the nobility, and government offices are chiefly represented, and what can be expected from a body so constituted? Even knowledge has scarcely penetrated this dense corporation. Why, indeed, should men seek information who want for nothing, who enjoy every advantage: with the people it has been different; they suffered long and grievously—they inquired—found out the cause—and are resolved, we fervently trust, to apply that sovereign power they possess to effect a sovereign remedy.

But the King and the Duke, it is rumoured, purpose to administer to a nation's disease! The King, unquestionably, is as true and upright an Englishman as ever sat on the throne; and the Duke is a mighty man of war; but we cannot say, in the threescore years of his preceding life he has ever shown any great sympathy, either in public liberty or public happiness. But, supposing the Duke willing, and we give him credit for good intentions, great shrewdness, and enterprise—what can he do against the Church and Aristocracy? He cannot twist the Bishops and Lords about as he did his *tenpenny-a-day* heroes at the battle of Waterloo. They have a great interest at stake;

they have cherished it long, and, doubtless, have derived much benefit from it; and we shall be somewhat surprised if they do not cling to the advantages they possess with the same tenacious fatuity, as the Stuarts and Bourbons to their prerogatives. Unless, however, his Grace will vitally touch these classes; unless he will, at one fell sweep, strike the rotten boroughs out of the representation, he will not advance a step either in reconciling the absurdities of the existing system, or in satisfying public expectation. As to tinkering the Scotch representation, or adding a *dozen* members to six hundred and fifty-eight, from the manufacturing towns, he might as well think of sweetening the briny ocean with a spoonful of sugar.

Meanwhile we shall wait in patience. Perhaps, before our labours can be delivered to the public the mountain, itself will have brought forth, and resolved all doubts. Whatever may be the result, we trust our readers will be attentive to the main point—namely, a democratic power in the state, which shall lighten the intolerable aristocratic load: we want no theories—no republic; we want the old system of king, lords, and commons thoroughly cleansed and renovated. Our grievances are practical, and we seek practical remedies. As we have all an interest in the public weal, we desire the means to protect and promote our social welfare. Our objects are a reform in the administration of justice—the church—the corn-laws—game-laws—partial taxation—the laws which regulate the press—the monopolies of the Bank and East-India Company; we wish a vast reduction in the national expenditure, and we wish Ireland to be tranquillized, and her great resources elicited. These reforms, we are fully aware, we can never have without a reform in parliament, and, therefore, first and foremost, we pray for that.

* * * *A List of the New House of Commons, their Connexions, &c. will be subsequently given.*

LAW

AND

COURTS OF LAW.

THE independence of the judges has so long formed a current theme of admiration, that it appears almost presumptuous to call it in question. Yet the difference between them and other functionaries is not so apparent as is generally assumed. It is true, the judges hold their situations for life, unless guilty of some flagrant impropriety; but the same may be said of other appointments under the Crown, the possessors of which are seldom disturbed, so long as they correctly discharge their duties; or if they are, they invariably receive a superannuation-allowance, or compensation, equivalent to the loss they have sustained. As respects, then, the tenure of office, the sages of the law cannot arrogate a great pre-eminence over other placemen: as respects those causes which ordinarily influence individual conduct—the lure of ambition—the temptation of lucre—and the seduction of indolence—they have still less to pride themselves. A judge, like a bishop, may be *translated* from a lower to a higher dignity—from a judgeship to a chief-justiceship, from that to a peerage or a seat in the cabinet; he may be removed from an office of £5,500 per annum to one of £10,000, and boundless patronage: he may be taken from a court where he is overwhelmed with the claims of duty, to one where the most important duty he has to discharge is to receive his salary. How then can it be alleged the judges are independent and exempt from ministerial influence, when the ministers have similar alluring temptations to hold out to the bench as other functionaries, and similar means of rewarding subserviency?

Other causes operate unfavourably on judicial appointments. Instead of the individuals elevated to the bench being a selection from the entire bar, of men the most distinguished for ability, probity, and independence, the choice of the ministry is limited to men of their own party. A Tory minister never chooses a Whig judge; nor the contrary. This tends to lower the character of the judges in public estimation, by clearly

evincing, that politics, as well as legal fitness, have a share in ministerial appointments. It also instils into the mind of both expectant judges, and of men already on the bench, a party feeling fatal to strict justice on political questions. So well established is this fact, that it is notorious, whenever a question comes before the tribunals, whether it be upon a prosecution for libel, or upon any other matter connected with government, the council, at their meetings, take for granted that they can tell pretty accurately the leaning of the court, and predict exactly which way the consultations of the judges will terminate. It is very unfortunate the judges should be always on the ministerial side of politics; but there is no help for this, while they continue to be selected on the exclusive principle. They have their opinions on public questions as well as other men; they know they fill a certain situation, and they cannot forget by whom they were placed there, or for what reason.

With these remarks we shall leave the venerable occupiers of the bench, on whom we had no intention of offering any observation; but in some way their situation obtruded itself on our notice, on first entering on the consideration of the important subject of this chapter. We shall now proceed briefly to notice the more prominent abuses in the laws and their administration.

The whole body of English Law is divided into two kinds—the Common and the Statute Law. The Common Law is founded entirely on custom, or precedent, and the decisions in the courts of justice. It is not founded on any Act of Parliament, nor on any legislative enactment; it is recorded in no public document; the only memorials of its existence, are to be found in traditional maxims, records of pleas, books of reports, or the treatises of men eminent in the profession. It is evident, that laws originating and preserved in this manner, must be vague, obscure, often absurd, and even contradictory. The Common Law is, in fact, a monument of the opinions, errors, knowledge, and ignorance, of every period of society; it has flowed down the stream of time, accumulating like some mighty river, and carrying along vestiges of the learning and ignorance, folly and wisdom, of every age through which it has passed.

How unworthy such an incongruous mass must be of the present age; how inapplicable to the usages of society; and how difficult it is for any individual to obtain a knowledge of such an *onus camelorum*, it is unnecessary to describe. Unsuitable as such a system of law is, to fulfil the ends for which all laws were originally intended, it forms a very considerable part of the laws of this country. It is in virtue of the common law, that the eldest son inherits from his father; that property may be purchased and transferred by writing; that a deed is void if not sealed and delivered; that money lent upon bond is recoverable by action of debt; and that a breach of the peace is punishable with fine and imprisonment. These are doctrines not established by any written statute or any legislative enactment, but depend solely upon immemorial usage.

So much for the Common or Unwritten Law; next for the Statute-

Law, which exhibits a still more frightful chaos. Statute-Law consists of all those acts, edicts, and statutes, made by the king, with the consent of the lords and commons in parliament assembled. The oldest of these now extant, and printed in the statute-books, is *Magna Charta*, as confirmed in parliament by 9 Hen. III. There were doubtless many acts before that time, the records of which are now lost; and which most probably were the foundation of some of the maxims in the old Common Law.

No man in England professes to be acquainted with the Statute-Law—not even the Lord Chancellor nor the Lord Chief Justice. It is such a prodigious compilation, that a knowledge of it is wholly unattainable. No one knows exactly what is law in England; though every individual is presumed to be acquainted with it, and ignorance is admitted as no excuse for its violation. Any one may become a legislator for the whole country; he has nothing to do but to turn to the statute-book; he will there find laws in abundance, of which no one has any knowledge; he may adduce them as the law of the land; he cannot be contradicted, unless some subsequent statute can be found by which it is repealed, and which it would probably require a-year's labour to discover. In some respects the statute-book may be compared to the scriptures. It contains many good maxims and excellent precepts; but, as a whole, it is contradictory, obscure, and inapplicable to the age. What one part affirms, another part denies. Laws may be adduced from it, like texts from the Bible, proving any thing and every thing, adapted to all times, principles, and occasions: one affords profitable employment for one hundred thousand wrangling lawyers; the other profitable employment for as many polemical divines: one is termed the perfection of human wisdom; the other a bright emanation from the Deity!

How ignorant the most eminent in the profession are on the subject, we may gather from a speech of the late Lord Stanhope, on the revision of the Statute-Book. Some of the most striking facts mentioned by his lordship, we will here insert. Conformably with a motion of his lordship, the judges were directed to prepare a bill, reducing into one act all the acts imposing the punishment of pillory. At the end of the bill the judges inserted some observations, stating that pillory was the punishment for some offences not merely by statute but at common law; and also they could not say whether their might *not be statutes on the subject which had escaped their attention*. Their surmise was just; for Lord Stanhope afterwards discovered two more statutes, passed in the reign of Geo. II. which had wholly escaped their investigation. Here then was an instance of the twelve judges not being able to discover all the acts inflicting a single punishment.

The same noble lord, wishing to ascertain how far the judges were agreed as to what was the law on several particulars, put to them various questions. For instance, he asked whether a person digging the brick earth from his own field, there manufactured into bricks, and sold, thereby made himself a trader liable to the bankrupt-laws? The judges of the Common Pleas were clearly of opinion one way, the judges

of the King's Bench were as clear the other. Lord Thurlow was reputed a most admirable common lawyer; but he was worsted on one occasion, in a dispute which he had with Lord Stanhope, on the subject of a statute; Lord Stanhope proving to be right, and old Thrumbo wrong. This, says Lord Stanhope, was a great feather in my cap. One day as these noble lords were sitting together on the woolsack, Lord Thurlow said, "I should be ashamed of myself if I was not accurately acquainted with the common law; but as to your d——d statute-book it is impossible to be acquainted with it." His lordship also related another anecdote of the celebrated Mr. Dunning, afterwards Lord Ashburton. Lord Stanhope consulted Mr. Dunning on a certain statute regulation relative to the excise, and his answer was, "Now I'll tell you all about it; but I never do answer these general questions when applied to by others. I always tell them, shew me the statute to which you refer, and I will *expound* it for you, but that is all I can do." Now this was doing about as much as we could do ourselves, or as much as any person could do, who has a tolerably clear head, and not much disturbed by worldly affairs.

The fact is, the lawyers and judges, in many cases, are as ignorant of the law as their clients and suitors. When a statute is produced, they can *expound* it, as Mr. Dunning terms it; so may any person who can read and understand the English language; but as to knowing whether it is the law of the land, whether it has been repealed or modified by any subsequent enactment, they are frequently as ignorant as the gaping spectator who looks upon them as infallible and inspired guides. We do not, however, accuse them of wilful ignorance; we do not say that, like the Fellows of Eton College, they are *willingly* ignorant of the statutes; they are generally men of laborious pursuits, who spare no pains to obtain a knowledge of the law; but we accuse them of a culpable indifference to the defective state of the statute-book, of either by their silence or open hostility opposing every attempt to reduce it into an intelligible form, originating either from a rooted prejudice against the reform of any thing and every thing, or solely from a wish to maintain the pecuniary interests of a multitudinous and rapacious profession.

Such is the immense number of law-books, and their ponderous size, that it would require the age of the patriarchs to acquire a knowledge of them. They are literally Ossa piled on Pelion, a huge unformed mass, which no man can fathom. Lord Stanhope mentions, a little *pocket compilation*, Viner's Abridgement, comprised into twenty volumes folio, which, it is considered necessary for every lawyer almost to know by heart. Gracious heaven! only think of that! Mind, too, this is a mere abridgement—bare memoranda of the great originals; and had it been continued to the present time it would have amounted to more than one hundred folio volumes, necessary to be carried either in the head or the pocket of every English lawyer. The most condensed edition of the Statutes at Large, yet given to the public, occupies thirty-nine volumes in quarto; seven volumes and a half of which comprise the acts from Magna Charta to the end of the reign of George II. the re-

maining thirty-one and a half being filled with those of the two last reigns. Since the Union with Ireland, a huge closely printed volume has been published every one, two, or three years, and the average number of public acts passed in each of the last twenty-eight years amounts to one hundred and forty. It is calculated that at the end of the present century, the statutes will occupy 100 ponderous quarto volumes, and the number of public acts will amount to fourteen thousand. The present generation complain of being overwhelmed with law, but what will be the situation of posterity?

We have said nothing yet of *Reports of Cases*. These form an indispensable part of a lawyer's knowledge. It is well known that decisions in courts of justice become a part of the law; and when a point has once been decided, it must be determined in the same way again, unless the precedent can be proved erroneous. Reports of these decisions are published annually; they already amount to upwards of 280 volumes, exclusive of those which relate to election, admiralty, and ecclesiastical law. But this is not all: they are going on increasing amazingly; every year adds eight more to the original stock; so that in twenty years there will be 160, and within the century 720 additional volumes, making 1000 volumes of reports, which, with 100 quarto volumes of statutes, will form a lawyer's library, that it is not only necessary he should read, but digest, and, if possible, understand.

This is English law, the perfection of human wisdom! Let us, however, pause a moment, to reflect on this mass of legal lumber, this grossly absurd system of legislation. It is considered a settled maxim in jurisprudence, that every state, within the limits of its own territory, ought to exact, and its subjects to yield obedience to, all its laws. The foundation of the obligation on the part of the people (say the Quarterly Reviewers) is, that the legislative authority on its part is presumed to have made the laws so CLEAR, that every member of the community either knows them or must be *culpably inattentive if he does not*. This principle is undeniable. It would never do to allow ignorance to be an excuse for the violation of laws. But how can any person be acquainted with English law? How can the legislature have gone on for centuries legislating on such an absurd presumption, and presuming that every individual in the empire was acquainted with their enactments? How can men of business read, digest, and understand one thousand volumes of reports, and one hundred quarto volumes of statutes? How can the people understand the law, when even the judges, whose whole lives are devoted to the subject, are in the most pitiable state of perplexity, uncertainty, and contradiction? Can any thing in the whole world be imagined more completely absurd and ridiculous? Had the whole system been blindly scraped together from every age, nation, and tribe in the universe, from the farthest extremity of Siberia to the remotest deserts of Garamantes, it could hardly have presented a more confused and hideous jumble than the Statute and Common Law of England.

One cause of this profuse, headlong, and inconsistent course of

legislation has been the reckless facility with which parliament has multiplied laws on a given subject, when a general enactment might have been framed adequate to the several occasions. Since the beginning of last century 4000 bills for enclosures of wastes in as many parishes have been passed, proving to demonstration the want of a general law on the subject; while, in the whole of that time, not a step has been taken towards enacting such a law, and so saving the community the prodigious waste of private funds and public time consumed in the passing of so many different statutes. The same observation applies to the innumerable acts passed for lighting towns with gas, and for the purposes of police and local improvements. Upwards of fifty acts have passed relative to game; forty-eight relative to parliamentary elections; and seventy-six indemnifying Dissenters for not qualifying themselves for offices and employments. There are many acts of a temporary and local nature. No fewer than sixty acts have passed for the recovery of small debts in different parts of the country, and fifty of them during the last two reigns. There are some acts relative to the baking of bread, and prohibiting the bakers from selling it unless it has been baked twenty-four hours. About the packing of butter, there are somewhere about a dozen different acts; as though it were necessary to instruct people to pack butter by act of parliament. One act on this subject relates to the packing of butter at Malton, in Yorkshire; another to the packing of butter in the city of York, a few miles distant; and another on the same subject for Ireland. Innumerable laws have been enacted relative to the woollen, linen, and cotton manufactures; the whale, cod, herring, and pilchard fisheries; cheese, lace, sugar, glass, and almost every article of wear or consumption have been the objects of parliamentary regulation. The whole of the statutes on wool amount to 987; on the subject of gold and silver, 290; on tobacco, 460; on the fisheries, 970; and on a variety of other subjects in proportion. Relative to the poor, there are 350 public acts; besides 135 local acts. By some of these acts, the poor are farmed out, by others flogged. Of these local acts, five passed in the reign of George II.; the remaining 130 in the reigns of George III. and George IV. Besides the number of acts, other causes, of the confusion and perplexity of the Statute-Book, arise from the immense number repealed and re-enacted, and then partly repealed again, with a "so far as," and "so forth;" also from the mass of altering, amending, and explaining acts; of acts, for instance, for "removing doubts," for "rectifying mistakes," for "relieving from the provisions," for "deferring the commencement," for "facilitating the execution,"—to say nothing of acts of total repeal. No fewer than 1874 acts were repealed in the reigns of George II. and III.; 419 in the former; and 1455 in the reign of the latter; which made Lord Stanhope remark, "they had been passing bills by waggon loads, and repealing them by cart loads."

Some feeble efforts were made during the reign of George IV. under the auspices of Sir R. Peel, to reduce the Statute-Law within more

reasonable limits. The parliament, dissolved in 1826, repealed, modified, or consolidated upwards of 1000 statutes. One act, the 3 Geo. IV. c. 41, repeals upwards of 200 statutes, or parts of statutes, relative to the exports and imports of merchandize; the commerce of aliens and denizens, the gauging of wine, and other mercantile regulations. The new Custom Law consolidated 450 acts of parliament into one; the Jury Act 30; the Bankrupt's Act 20; and the new acts on larceny and forgery, of the last and preceding sessions, have effected a considerable compression. Still the evil is of such magnitude that there is scarcely perceptible diminution in its amount; nor do we anticipate—for reasons we shall hereafter explain—any decided improvements in jurisprudence either from the consolidatory acts of the Secretary of State, or from the other projects of legal reform now in progress.

Nothing has tended so much to swell the Statute-Book as the enormous increase in taxation, and the consequent increase in the number of Revenue-Laws. During each of the last twenty-eight years, the number of acts passed, which relate strictly to the revenue, has amounted to forty; and those which are connected with them indirectly, and but for them would never have existed, to nearly twenty more; which comprises about half the whole number of laws annually enacted. The acts lately in force with regard to spirits alone amounted to 140; an attempt has been made to consolidate them, but as new acts are yearly being added, both as regards spirits and custom duties, the merchant and trader will soon be involved in as great a labyrinth as ever. The stamp-acts amount to more than 150, and they still remain unconsolidated. So do the innumerable acts relative to the coin. Soap, candles, and the distilleries are under excise lock and key; and, in many instances of exciseable manufacture, it is impossible to carry on the different steps of the process with advantage, from the delay and interruption from the visits of the excise. What a bungling piece of legislation has been the attempt to simplify and regulate the malt-duties!

On the middling classes these laws are peculiarly oppressive;—and yet they are unceasingly told, and many of them apparently believe, that a *reform in parliament could do no good!* Would it not, we would ask, relieve them from the vexatious inquisition and endless interruption and restraint on the operations of trade under which they now labour? Would it not, in short, cause an entire revision of that cumbersome and absurd system of jurisprudence which we have attempted to describe;—reduce the Statute-Book to one-hundredth part its present bulk; consolidate the almost innumerable local acts into more general laws; and abolish all those unjust and impolitic enactments which interfere with industry and commerce. Such numerous laws are no doubt useful to the profession, they afford a fruitful and endless source of litigation; they are *glorious* things, as Lord Stanhope remarked, for attorneys, conveyancers, special pleaders, barristers, and so forth, but most inglorious and calamitous for the public.

We shall only make one or two more remarks on Statute-Law, and

that is relative to the language and manner in which acts of parliament are drawn up. It is evident that all laws ought to be intelligible to those on whom they are intended to operate; otherwise, it is wilfully creating an ignorance which will not be admitted as any excuse for their violation. It is difficult to see why they could not be so clearly and simply worded as to be intelligible to ordinary capacities, without the assistance of either attorney or lawyer. They involve no abstract theorem; they are a mere statement of facts, requiring something to be done or not to be done; which, really one would think, might be made intelligible without the continual assistance of interpreters, at an enormous expense. The obscurity and perplexity of statutes arise principally from a perverse deviation from the ordinary language of civil life, an overwhelming verbosity and endless repetition of "he, she, they," "him, her, it, and them," the "aforesaid," and "so far as," the "so forths," &c. which render the whole so involved and perplexed, that one would suppose the legislature, instead of endeavouring to render the laws as lucid as possible, had purposely involved them in the greatest possible darkness. From the habitual indulgence of fiction and tautology the minds of lawyers—for it is lawyers who draw up acts of parliament—become so inveterately alien to truth and simplicity that they cannot be otherwise if they would; and, accordingly, we find in those cases, when their intention has really been to be intelligible, that their language involves so much complexity—there are so many crotchets and puzzles—that they entirely fail in their purpose, and defy comprehension by ordinary minds. We shall give an instance of this from one of Sir Robert Peel's consolidatory acts, the 7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 28; which is the more remarkable, because the express object of it is to obviate obscurity and misapprehension, by giving a simple and general rule for the interpretation of criminal statutes. The clause to which we allude is the 14th, and expressed as follows:—"Whenever this or any other statute relating to any offence, whether punishable upon indictment or summary conviction, in describing or referring to the offence, or the subject matter on or with respect to which it shall be committed, or the offender or the party affected or intended to be affected by the offence, hath used, or shall use words importing the singular number or the masculine gender only, yet the statute shall be understood to include several matters as well as one matter, and several persons as well as one person, and females as well as males, and bodies corporate as well as individuals, unless it be otherwise specially provided, or there be something in the subject or context repugnant to such construction; and wherever any forfeiture or penalty is payable to a party aggrieved, it shall be payable to a body corporate in every case where such body shall be the party aggrieved."

An *unlearned* person might possibly guess at the intended meaning of this explanatory rule, and a lawyer no doubt—and this would be deemed by him its chief excellence—would be able to draw from it a dozen different interpretations, according as they best suited the purposes of his client.

Things the most heterogeneous are frequently jumbled together in the same act of parliament, and the title is often as remote as possible from the subject matter of the statute. These are called "Hodge-podge Acts," and are very numerous. Who, for instance, would expect to find the regulations under which petitions may be forwarded to members of parliament, in an act for laying an *additional duty upon tea and sugar*? The commencing clause of the statute, under which Vauxhall and other theatres and places of entertainment are licensed, is as follows:—"Whereas, the advertising a reward with no questions asked, for the return of things lost or stolen, is one great cause and encouragement of robberies, be it enacted," &c. Many may recollect that Sir R. Peel, on introducing to parliament his bill for amending the larceny-laws (March 9th, 1826), cited the title of one single act, which embraces no fewer than the following bizarre miscellany:—the continuing several laws therein mentioned; the carrying of sugars in British-built vessels; the encouraging the importation of naval stores; preventing frauds in the admeasurement of coals in the city of Westminster; and preventing the stealing or *destroying of madder roots*. Another act he referred to forms a still more whimsical olio, and is intitled "An Act for better securing the duties of customs on certain goods removed to London; for regulating the fees of officers in His Majesty's customs in the province of Segambia, in Africa; for allowing the Receiver-General of Fees in Scotland proper compensation; for the better preservation of hollies, thorns, and quick-sets in private grounds, and trees and underwoods; and authorising the exportation of a limited quantity of barley from the Port of Kirkgrow." Such acts run very much like cross-readings in a newspaper, and those who wish for further amusement of the sort will find it in Mr. Wickens's publication on the *Division of Labour in Civil Life*, where the subject is pursued to a greater extent than our limits will admit.

Notwithstanding the laborious and tiresome precision of statutes, they frequently comprise the most egregious blunders. There is a singular instance of one in the 53d George III.: by the 18th section, one half the penalty is to go to the king and the other half to the informer; but the penalty happened in this case not to be a fine, but fourteen years' transportation; so that fourteen years' transportation were to be equally divided between Messrs. Byers and Co. and his Majesty!

Perhaps our readers may deem this too old a blunder to illustrate the deliberative wisdom of the law-makers of the reign of William IV. If so, we shall give them an example of legislative aptitude from one of the most important acts of last session—that for Consolidating and Amending the Laws on Forgery. This statute was drawn, we believe, by Messrs. Hobhouse and Gregson, and was some years in preparation, under the auspices of Sir R. Peel; it received the tinkering of Sir James Scarlett, between whom and the gentlemen by whom it was framed, some difference of opinion respecting its provisions arose, which could only be terminated by an appeal to Lord Tenterden, who felt himself bound to decide, notwithstanding his well-known partiality,

against the attorney-general. Well, this act so patronised, elaborated, revised, quarrelled about, and arbitrated, is at length brought forth, passed, and is now the law of the land; and we will venture to say, a more defective and bungling piece of legislation is not to be found in the great book of conundrums and absurdities itself. What the public expected was an act that would comprise the entire statute-law of forgery; unless this was attained, little benefit could result from adding one more statute to the 400 previously existing. Instead of consolidating the law, it merely embodies the whole or part of the provisions of *twenty-seven* statutes out of the mass; all the acts relative to the forging of stamps, seamen's warrants, plate-marks, and on the post-office, remain scattered, as heretofore, through the boundless waste of the Statutes at Large, to be applied or not, as it may happen, by judges and lawyers. Incompleteness is not the worst defect in this statute; some of its provisions are obviously incompatible, and the commencing part of the act seems to have been entirely lost sight of when the concluding part was agreed upon. For proof of this compare the following sections, nearly the first and last, in the statute.

" § II. And be it enacted, That if any person shall forge or counterfeit, or shall utter, knowing the same to be forged or counterfeited, the great seal of the United Kingdom, his Majesty's privy seal, any privy signet of his Majesty, his Majesty's royal sign manual, any of his Majesty's seals appointed by the twenty-fourth article of the Union to be *kept, used, and continued in Scotland*, the great seal of Ireland, or the privy seal of Ireland, every such offender shall be guilty of high treason, and shall suffer death accordingly."

" § XXIX. And be it enacted, That this act *shall not extend to any offence committed in Scotland or Ireland.*"

Here we see, in the second section, a specific punishment assigned for the commission of an offence in Scotland; and, in a subsequent section, it is expressly declared the act shall not extend to any offence committed in Scotland or Ireland. What the judges will make of this inconsistency, when it comes before them, it is impossible to foresee: we suppose we shall have another act or two to "*explain*" or "*amend*," &c.; and so our legislature proceeds, heaping one act upon another, making delightful work for lawyers, and "*raining*," as Mr. Bentham expresses it, "*snares among the people.*"

One cause of this blundering work is to be found in the vicious mode of transacting business in the House of Commons. It is well known law-making is a sort of after-dinner amusement, which commences when gentlemen have taken their wine—when the theatres have closed—and the night-houses are thrown open for the reception of customers. It cannot be matter of surprise if, under such unfavourable circumstances, the nocturnal occupations of the Collective Wisdom exhibit strange examples of forgetfulness, haste, and confusion. We, indeed, are often astonished things are not worse, when we reflect on the course of parliamentary proceedings—no division of labour, or exclusive devotion to legislative duty—all chance medley, helter skelter, volunteer and

amateur exertion—the chief manager straining every nerve to get through public business before the setting in of the Dog-days—stratagems to steal a march on Mr. Hume or Sir James Graham with the estimates—packing a house for a job or private bill—jaded ministers dropping in late from their offices or a protracted cabinet-council—country gentlemen from a tedious morning-waiting at the Treasury for places and appointments—lawyers from the courts—and the sons of riot reel in, at midnight, from the saloons and club-houses, in quest of divertisement—and thus business goes on, and a house is formed of men distracted with their individual avocations, or suffering from lassitude and over-excitement. They talk and talk, it is true, without end, as people mostly do when not fully master of their subject; but their ideas are crude—there has been no preparation or concentration of thought—and all their doings bear evident marks of the intellectual chaos from which they spring. We had a ludicrous illustration of what we are stating only last session: the House was in a committee, and had been debating, as usual, to no purpose, for the space of six hours, when the chairman got up, and, with great gravity, said “he should be extremely obliged by any honourable member informing him what they had all been talking about!”

Such mode of legislation has striking results: it impoverishes the people by litigation, and multiplies and augments the emoluments of a mercenary profession. In the number and magnitude of inns of court and other public buildings the legal classes rival the ancient religious houses; and their unavoidable and constant intervention in all the affairs and transactions of civil life gives them an influence equal to that of the priesthood in the ages of superstition. In the metropolis are nine superior courts, four ecclesiastical courts, twenty courts for recovery of small debts, besides courts of oyer and terminer, courts of general and quarter sessions, coroner-courts, and courts of petty sessions for the purposes of police. Attached to these courts are eight hundred officers, exclusive of judicial functionaries. To these may be added 500 barristers-at-law, 3000 certificated attorneys, 130 conveyancers and equity draftsman, 67 special pleaders, 84 proctors, 40 public notaries, 6000 clerks and assistants, besides doctors-at-law, sergeants-at-law, and king's counsel, making a legal phalanx, in the metropolis, of nearly 10,000. In the country they are not so concentrated, but more numerous. From “Clarke's Law List” it appears there are, in the country, including England and Wales, 4500 attorneys and conveyancers who have taken out certificates. The number of clerks and assistants cannot be estimated at less than 9000; so that the number of persons in the country, in the legal department, is 13,500; and if we add 10,000 for persons of a similar description in the metropolis, we have a total of 23,500 persons, whose sole employment is to render the laws intelligible, and justice attainable to the people in England and Wales.

This estimate, we are persuaded, is a great deal below the truth: many attorneys in town employ more than twenty clerks, and the majority of them employ three or four. Perhaps it would not be too

much to estimate the total number of counsel, attorneys, clerks, assistants, &c. in England and Wales, at thirty thousand. In this enumeration is not included the justices of peace, amounting to 4,500, nor the judges in the different courts, the sheriffs, nor any portion of the magistracy, whose office it is to administer justice, and who employ an innumerable number of clerks and assistants. The classes we have mentioned form only that branch of the profession who owe their origin, in a great measure, to defects and obscurities in our jurisprudence. It is the duty of the legislature to render the laws so clear, and the form of proceeding so simple, that persons of ordinary comprehension would generally be able to understand the one and pursue the other, without the aid, in every case, of a legal adviser.

The adage says—*Many hands make light work*; but the maxim is reversed in law; and the swarm of practitioners is a principal cause of the multiplication of suits, their protracted duration, and consequent pressure of business in the courts.

Dr. Colquhoun estimated the total income of the legal classes, when the amount of property and professional practice were greatly less than at present, at £7,600,000 per annum; and two-thirds, probably, of this sum is absorbed by *legalists* resident in London.

However, this can be only considered a vague approximation. In our list of places we shall give an account of the emoluments and incomes of the chief justices, the lord chancellor, the judges, and several other well-known individuals; but the incomes of the profession generally, of counsellors, special pleaders, conveyancers, and attorneys, are so various, that it is impossible to fix on any average amount. The late Sir Samuel Romilly, it is credibly reported, netted £15,000 annually from his professional avocations. There are other counsel who, probably, make ten or twelve thousand a-year; others, a half, a third, a fourth, or twentieth part of that sum; and others, again, who make nothing. Sir James Scarlett has received as much as £400 for a single brief on the northern circuit. In the incomes of attorneys are similar diversities. Some few, in London, make ten or eleven thousand pounds a-year; a great many more about three or four thousand pounds; and some obscure practitioners do not clear more than £100 a-year. Their clerks experience the same variety of fortune. Some are starving on a paltry £50; others living comfortably on £200; and others sumptuously on a £500 salary.

The emoluments and salaries of the masters, registrars, and clerks in Chancery; of the judges in the Admiralty, and ecclesiastical courts, and of the law-officers of the Crown, have been more than doubled since the commencement of the revolutionary war. In 1792 the salary of the chief justice of the King's Bench was £4,000; of the Common Pleas £3,500; of the chief baron of the Exchequer, £3,500; all these have been respectively augmented to £10,000, £8,000, and £7,000 per annum; and the salaries of the puisne judges and barons of the three superior courts have been raised from £2,400 to £5,500 per annum.

each.* All the judges have patronages—that of the chief justice very valuable, and of which we shall hereafter give some account; they have, also, some fees remaining, though the principal portion has been commuted. It has been related of these exalted personages, that, at the time sixteen journeymen boot-closers were committed to Newgate, for a conspiracy to raise their wages, they were sitting in their chambers in Serjeant's Inn conspiring to raise their own salaries, in consequence of the rise of the *necessaries of life*. This anecdote reminds us of the fable of the Wolf and the Shepherd. A wolf, says Plutarch, happening to put his head into a hut, where some shepherds were regaling on a leg of mutton, exclaimed—*Ah! what a clamour you would have raised, had you caught me at such a banquet!* The demeanour of the sages of the law would be something similar; they would declaim eloquently on the evils of conspiring when committed by workmen, though it might be done by themselves with impunity.

An important fact connected with legalists is, the enormous increase in their numbers within the last ten years. In 1820 we were engaged in an inquiry similar to the present; and we find, in the interval, the number of attorneys in the metropolis has augmented *fifty per cent.* There has, no doubt, been a corresponding increase in the country, and in other branches of the profession; and far exceeds the contemporary increment in property and population. It arises, we presume, from the increasing number and perplexities of the laws, which have rendered additional guides, commentators, expounders, and interpreters indispensable; or, it may have arisen from the large fortunes suddenly amassed by dealers in the black art, which have tempted more than a fair proportion of the community to embark in so lucrative a calling. Whatever may be the cause, it is not creditable to our judicial administration; nor is it a flattering symptom of social happiness and improvement.

The increase of litigation, and, consequently, of profit to the profession, is demonstrated by the increase of business in the superior courts, as is shown by the following statement of the number of causes entered for trial:—

Years.	King's Bench.	Common Pleas.	Exchequer.
1823.....	1474.....	445.....	162
1824.....	1695.....	472.....	222
1825.....	2164.....	500.....	157
1826.....	3112.....	1021.....	245

The vast number of bankruptcies and insolvencies of late years must have tended enormously to the emolument of the legal profession, and have rendered them the richest class in the community. The number of persons who took the benefit of the Insolvent Act, in 1815, amounted to 2886; in 1820, they had increased to 4012; and in 1826, to 4681.† The number of bankrupts, in 1814, was 1612; in 1820, 1381; in

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 532, Session 1830.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 42, Session 1828.

1826, 2582; in 1829, 1654.* All these breakings up yield an abundant harvest of spoil to the gentlemen of the long robe. In most bankruptcies the solicitors, the bar, the commissioners, the accountants, and auctioneers divide the assets. Very few estates pay anything worth a man's while going after. Under the present bankrupt-law, a man has nothing to do but to get into credit to as large an amount as possible—buy goods in every place—turn merchant—ship off such goods to every quarter of the world—fly *kites* in every possible way—keep no books, or those so confusedly that no man, called in by the name of an accountant, could make head or tail of them—carry this system of buying, and exporting, and kite-flying to its utmost extent—purchase goods on credit at any price, and for the greatest length of time—declare his insolvency—go into the Gazette; the solicitors, the bar, the commissioners, the accountants, and the auctioneers would set to work; the larger the amount of the man's debts so much the better for the legal, accounting, and auctioneering agents. In such case, the professional men call it a *good fat bankruptcy*; and, if they can get it into chancery, so much the better; and, in general, it is contrived that a *good fat bankruptcy* shall get into chancery. The result, in general, is—ten or twelve years' meetings of commissioners, actions, bills in chancery; and at length, when the legalists have absorbed the estate, they tire, and the creditors are told, "Here, gentlemen, are the accounts!"

Mr. Montague has justly characterised a commission of bankruptcy "a tribunal in which the minimum of justice is administered at the maximum of expense." All the commissioners are either very old or very young men, whose only pretensions are the friendship of the chancellor, or the friendship of some friend of the chancellor, or others connected with the government. They are all either counsel or solicitors, whose sole object is to gain as much money in as little time as possible. Some of them understand the art of accomplishing this so well as to have been known to boast of pocketing thirty guineas a-day. These, however, are only ignoble quarry, compared with the great fee-gatherer himself. It appears, from a parliamentary return, last session, that the several sums sacked by the *purse-bearer* to the lord chancellor, in the year ending 30th April, 1830, amounted to £4081.† In the same year, the sealing of 4861 writs, at 3s. 3d. each, produced £789, which was shared between his lordship, chaff-wax, sealer, and porter. From returns in the same year, the masters in chancery appear to net £4000 per annum, their chief clerk upwards of £1000, and the copying clerk £500 and more. Mr. Wellesley, in a book lately published by him, on the court of chancery, states that the litigation into which he has been forced has cost him £20,000 in four years, and a sum of equal amount has been paid out of the estates of his children. Mr. Davies, the

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 260, Session 1830.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 626, Session 1830.

late tea-dealer, of Philpot-lane, was put to an expense of £32,000 by a chancery commission, appointed to ascertain whether he was in a *sound state of mind*. Sir E. Sugden stated, not long since, that the equity proceedings, under the will of Mr. Thellusson, had been as productive to lawyers as many principalities to their sovereigns. But we must return to the subject from which we have digressed.

The fraud, impoverishment, and desolation resulting from the administration of the Debtor-Laws are almost incredible. In the processes issued against the person, lawyers and attorneys are the parties who chiefly profit. From returns of affidavits of debts, it appears, in two years and a half, 70,000 persons were arrested in and about London, the law-expenses of which could not be less than *half a million*.* In the year 1827, in the metropolis and two adjoining counties, 23,515 warrants to arrest were granted, and 11,317 bailable processes executed.† Thus were eleven thousand persons deprived of their liberty on the mere declarations of others, before any trial or proof that they owed a farthing! So gainful is the trade to attorneys, that they frequently buy up small bills for the purpose of suing the endorsers, and bring nine or ten actions on each. One house alone has brought five hundred actions in this way, and most of them for sums under £20.

The sum on which arrest is allowed has been gradually augmented to £20; but this is too small, and the consequence is, the prisons are crowded with debtors for the most paltry amounts. The number of persons committed to the five principal prisons of the metropolis, exclusive of crown debtors, and those imprisoned for contempt, averages 5000 per annum. Of these more than *one-third are for sums under £20*. In the years 1826-7, the Court of Requests for the city of London imprisoned 753 persons for various terms, from twenty to one hundred days, for sums under £5. In the same year, the Court of Requests for Southwark ordered 9758 executions, and 1893 persons were actually imprisoned for debts amounting only to £16,442.‡

The minor tribunals for facilitating the recovery of small debts we do not think entitled to the praise usually awarded them. They foment domestic animosities, promote law-suits, and encourage a trumpery system of credit, which is ultimately ruinous both to the retail tradesman and his customers.§ Neither are they so economical a source as is generally imagined; the costs of proceedings in them usually amounting to a tax of *twenty-five per cent.* payable either by creditor or debtor. A debt can seldom be recovered in the Marshalsea or Palace Court for less than £8, even if no resistance is offered. In the several courts of request for the city of London, Middlesex, West-

* Mr. Hume, House of Commons, February 19, 1827.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 149, Session 1827.

‡ Parliamentary Paper, No. 487, Session 1828.

§ Treatise on the Police and Crimes of the Metropolis, by the Editor of the Cabinet Lawyer, where the tendency of the debtor-laws is more fully investigated.

minster, and the Borough, the expenses of recovering a debt of 40s. or under, is at least 11s.; above that sum, twice as much. Such a system can be no advantage to trade; it only tends to fill the coffers of attorneys and clerks of courts, by the ruin of the industrious classes. Only think of the fees received in the request court of Southwark amounting, in one year, to £4255, of which £2475 arose from debts of 40s. or under. In four years, the fees received, in the request court of the City, amounted to £7322.* Our legal institutions are chiefly beneficial to those under whose auspices their rules and modes of procedure have been framed and regulated. Hence the circuitry and expense of law-suits. No prudent man ever thinks it for his interest to sue for a debt below £15; the costs in prosecuting for a small debt being equal to a large one, owing to the proceedings being the same, and the pleadings as voluminous for the recovery of a few shillings as £100. In the King's Bench, the expenses of recovering a debt under £5, even if no defence is made, and judgment goes by default, are not less than £15; if defendant appear, and, as is not uncommonly the case, puts in a dilatory plea, they are increased to £20; and, by taking out a writ of error, they are still further augmented. The following receipt has been often given to debtors, who wish to be troublesome, and to weary out their creditors by an expensive process:—

When arrested and held to bail, and after being served with a declaration, you may plead the general issue, which puts you on for trial sooner than any other plea; but, if you wish to vex your plaintiff, and put him about, put in a special plea; if you are in custody, order your attorney to plead in person, this will cost you £1:1, and run your plaintiff to £30 expense. If you do not intend to try the cause, you have no occasion to do any thing more till the plaintiff gets judgment against you, which he must do the term after you have put in a special plea. The plaintiff is obliged to send you a paper book, which you must return to his attorney with 7s. 6d. otherwise you will not put him to more than half the expense. When he proceeds and gets judgment against you, then order your attorney to search the Final Judgment Office, in the Temple; when searched, and found they have got final judgment signed against you, then give plaintiff's attorney notice for him and your attorney to be present with the master at the time the plaintiff taxes the costs; at which time your attorney must have a writ of error with him to give to the plaintiff's attorney before the master, at the time the master taxes the costs; it will put the plaintiff to great expense, which he will have to pay, or go the ground over again. The writ of error will cost you £4:4 by a London attorney; but, if you wish to be more troublesome, make the writ returnable in parliament, which will cost you £1:1 more, and your plaintiff £100. If he has the courage to follow you further, you may then file a bill in Chancery or Exchequer; if he does not then give his answer, your bill will get an injunction against him: you may then get an attachment from the

* Report on Small Debts, Parliamentary Paper, vol. iv. Session 1823.

court where your bill was filed, and take his body for contempt of court. The costs incurred by plaintiff and defendant, respectively, will then be as follows :—

<i>Plaintiff's Costs.</i>				<i>Defendant's Costs.</i>			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Answer to Special Plea ..	30	0	0	Special Plea	1	1	0
Ditto Writ of Error	100	0	0	Paper Book	0	7	6
Ditto Bill in Chancery....	100	0	0	Writ of Error.....	4	4	0
Ditto Bill in Exchequer ..	84	0	0	Returnable in Parliament .	1	1	0
				To Bill in Chancery	12	0	0
				To Bill in Exchequer	6	6	0
	<u>£314</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>				
					<u>£24</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>6</u>

This is a fine exemplification of law, and shows how greater are the advantages offered to finesse and knavery than to integrity and plain dealing. Some restraints are laid on frivolous writs of error by 6 Geo. IV. c. 96, but in other respects the above outline is a substantially correct exposition of the legal resources available to the unprincipled debtor for harassing his creditor.

SUMMARY OF LEGAL ABUSES AND DEFECTS.

In the preceding exposition our principal objects have been to give a general idea of the law of England; secondly, the number and gains of the individuals engaged in their administration; thirdly, the abuses and defects in those laws especially intended for the benefit of trade; and, lastly, we have brought together a multitude of facts, to exemplify the emoluments and salaries of judges and the fees of lawyers and attorneys, in order to show the mass of interest-begotten prejudices that must interfere with, if not be absolutely arrayed against efficient reform in the judicial system. After proceeding thus far, we still despair of bringing the remainder of our subject within reasonable limits. Mr. Brougham, after an extraordinary speech of six hours' duration, was compelled to leave various departments of legal delinquency unexplored, though equally claiming the attention of his powerful mind. All that our circumscribed space will permit is an indication or digest of the more prominent defects, and this we shall endeavour to comprise in the present section. Abuses often exist only because they are concealed, and the first step to their reform is general publicity.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.—These are virtually appointed by lords lieutenant of counties; for, though the lord chancellor issues the commission, it is the lord lieutenant who designates the persons comprehended in it. Hence an important source of aristocratic influence; which is exerted in raising to the magisterial bench gentlemen who have distinguished themselves by their political opinions or activity in local contests. The tenure of office is fully as secure as that of the judges; whatever be the conduct of a justice, he is seldom removed; and lord Eldon laid it down as an inflexible rule never to strike a magistrate

off the list, either for private misconduct or party feeling, until he had been convicted of some offence by the verdict of a court of record, and such conviction, it is notorious, is wholly unattainable. Hence these petty judges may be considered so many irremovable and irresponsible functionaries, and the great power confided to them in the administration of the game-laws, the punishment of theft and assaults, and the granting of licenses are very liable to be abused. Numerous instances of abuse were cited by Mr. Brougham, in his great speech of the 7th of February, 1828. Still we do not agree with this gentleman in thinking, as he seems to incline, that a *stipendiary* magistracy, consisting of lawyers, would, in lieu of the unpaid magistracy, afford the best security for a pure and independent administration of justice. Costly justice, no doubt, is better than cheap injustice. But lawyers have their prejudices as well as sporting parsons and sporting squires; and we think justice would be quite as corrupt when paid for as when administered gratuitously, unless there were responsibility. This would be best obtained by the entire publicity of justiciary proceedings;—here is the best guarantee against abuse in all functionaries of whatever rank or degree. The game-laws are a source of intolerable oppression; but these ought to be reformed, and game protected like other property, and no better. Clergymen ought to be disqualified for the magisterial office as for other lay functions, and justices, in lieu of being nominated by the aristocracy, might be chosen on a similar principle to that of a coroner for the county, or the registrar for the West Riding of Yorkshire. With these reforms the magistracy would be made a much less objectionable branch of domestic jurisprudence, especially as a material source of their misdoings has been curtailed by the opening of the beer trade.

DIFFERENT LAWS IN DIFFERENT PLACES.—Nothing can be more inconsistent than the different modes of inheritance and tenure in the different districts of the country. In the county of Middlesex the eldest son succeeds to the estate; cross over the Thames, into Kent, and all the sons succeed to the ancestor's inheritance in equal shares; proceed a little to the westward, and another law prevails, the youngest son inheriting the land to the exclusion of the other children. What can be the motive for perpetuating these divers usages—the relics of a barbarous age—in a county subject to the same general government? But even the customs of gavelkind and borough-English are not so inconvenient as those which regulate the customary tenures in a thousand different manors. In one manor copyhold property is not devisable by will; in another it may be so conveyed. In one manor a devise is not valid, if made longer than two years before the testator's decease; so that it is necessary for wills to be *renewed every two years*; in another one year; in a third three years are the period; while in many there are no such restrictions. In some manors the eldest daughter succeeds to the exclusion of her sisters, as the eldest daughter (in default of male heirs) succeeds to the crown of England; in other manors all the daughters succeed jointly, as co-parceners, after the manner of the

common law. In some manors a wife has her dower, one-third of the tenement, as in case of freehold. In others she has, for her "*free bench*," one-half; and again, in some, she takes the whole for life, to the exclusion of the heir. The fines on death or alienation vary; the power and manner of entailing or cutting off entails vary; the taking of heriots and lords' services varies.* There are as many or more of these local laws than in France, in the *Pays de Coutume*, of which four hundred have been enumerated, so as to make it the chief opprobrium of the old French law, that it differed in every village. Is it right that such varieties of custom should be allowed to have force in particular districts, contrary to the general law of the land? Is it right that, in London, Bristol, and some other places, the debts due to a man should be subject to execution for what he owes himself, while in all the rest of England there is no such resource; although in Scotland, as in France, this most rational and equitable law is universal?

All these varieties of tenure and diversities of liability are only so many traps to the ignorant and unwary, and so many impediments to the transmission and circulation of property. They embarrass commerce, by making it difficult—in some cases impossible—for a man to get the full value for his property, or dispose of it at all. For copyhold property is not liable even for specialty debts, nor can it be extended by elegit; and thus, absurd and unjust as is the law which prevents freehold property from being charged with simple contract debts, it goes further in this instance, and exempts the copyhold from liability, even to those of the highest nature, a judgment itself not giving the creditor any right of execution against it. The obvious remedy to be adopted in this case is to give all parts of the country the same rules touching property; and, therefore, Mr. Brougham, in his memorable speech, proposed an assimilation of the laws, affecting real estates, all over the kingdom, to take place after the elapse of a fixed period.

DIFFERENT LAWS FOR DIFFERENT PERSONS.—Sir W. Blackstone was very fond of asserting that the Crown and the people were, in law, on an equal footing, and that the King, in a court of justice, was no more considered than a subject. This is not correct. It is true a person injured, in his property, by the Crown, may proceed by a *petition of right*, having first obtained the consent of the attorney-general; but the attorney-general may refuse his *fiat*, and then the subject is without remedy, except the hopeless resource of an impeachment of the officer of the Crown. Again, in cases where the Crown is interested, the Crown has a right, at the mere suggestion of the attorney-general, to call for a *trial at bar*; and thus the subject be obliged to bring all the witnesses up, from Cornwall, perhaps, or some other remote county. After all this expense is incurred, by reason of the Crown demanding a trial in London, where the other party is not known, and not in Cornwall, where both parties are known, the Crown

* Mr. Brougham, House of Commons, Feb. 7, 1828, printed speech, p. 45.

may withdraw the case from the consideration of the jury, after the examination of all the witnesses, even at the moment that the jury are, with their backs turned, deliberating about their verdict.

But it is said the Crown pays expenses; the subject, however, has his own expenses to pay. As the Crown is above receiving costs, so it is exempt from paying them. The reason of this practice it is not easy to discover. One cannot see how the dignity of the Crown is exalted by not receiving costs, when they reflect that, by the Crown, is meant the revenue raised from the people for the public service, and that, consequently, the non-payment of costs to the Crown is an increase of the people's burthens.* But, even if we admit the propriety of the Crown's receiving none, it would by no means follow that it should pay none to the subject, who is in a widely different predicament. All this, however, arises out of notions derived from the *feudal times*, when the Crown was in a situation the very reverse of that in which it stands at present, its income then arising almost entirely from a land-revenue. There is now no reason why it should be exempt from paying, or disabled from receiving, in all cases where costs would be due between common persons. Indeed, there has been of late years an exception made in the crown-law on this head, but so as to augment the inequality complained of. In all stamp prosecutions, the costs of the Crown are paid by the *unsuccessful defendant*; so far does it stoop from its former dignity; but not so low as to pay the defendant a farthing of his costs, should he be acquitted.

We shall only mention one more case to illustrate the legal disparity between the King and the people. Whenever a special jury is summoned in a Crown case, and all the twelve jurors do not attend, a tales cannot be prayed to let the cause proceed, without a *warrant from the attorney-general*; so that it is in the power of your adversary to refuse this at the time it may be most for his advantage so to do; while you have no option whatever, in case it should be for his interest to proceed, and for yours to delay. A singular instance of oppression, under this usage, was related by Mr. Brougham, in the celebrated speech to which we have referred. A person named Lowe, with four smugglers, was prosecuted in the Court of Exchequer. The accused were acquitted on the second trial, and Meade, one of the witnesses against them, and others connected with him, were prosecuted for perjury; eighteen indictments were found at the sessions, and the Crown at once removed the whole, by *certiorari*, into the Court of King's Bench. There they were all to be tried. Meade was the first tried, and clearly convicted. The other seventeen were then to be tried, and Mr. Sergeant Jones called them on; but the Crown had made the whole eighteen special jury causes; a sufficient number of jurymen did not attend; Mr. Sergeant Jones wanted to pray a tales, and *the Crown refused a warrant*. "Thus," says Mr. Brougham, "an expense of £10,000 was incurred, and a hundred witnesses were brought to London, all for nothing, except, after the vexation, trouble, and delay already endured, to work the ruin of the prosecutor, who

had been first harassed upon the testimony of the perjured witnesses. The poor Yorkshire farmer, whom the villain had so vexed, had no more money to spend in law; all the other prosecutions dropped; Meade obtained a rule for a new trial, but funds were wanting to meet him again, and he escaped. So that public justice was utterly frustrated, as well as the most grievous wrong inflicted upon an individual. Nor did it end here; the poor farmer was fated to lose his life by the transaction. Meade, the false witness, and Lowe, the farmer, whom he had informed against, and who was become the witness against him upon the approaching trial, lived in the same village; and one evening, in consequence, as was alleged, of some song, or madrigal, sung by him in the street, this man (Meade) seized a gun, and shot Lowe, from his house, dead upon the spot. He was acquitted of the murder, on the ground of something like provocation, but he was found guilty of manslaughter, and such was the impression of his guilt upon the mind of the court, that he was sentenced two years' imprisonment. A case of more complicated injustice—one fraught with more cruel injustice to the parties, I never knew in this country, nor do I conceive that worse can be found in any other. We may talk of our excellent institutions, and excellent some of them certainly are, though I could wish we were not given to so much Pharisaical praising of them; but if, while others, who do more and talk less, go on improving their laws, we stand still, and suffer all our worst abuses to continue, we shall soon cease to be respected by our neighbours, or to receive any praises, save those we are so ready to lavish upon ourselves."—pp. 50-1. So much for the even-handed justice, lauded by Mr. Justice Blackstone, between the Crown and the people!

FINES AND RECOVERIES.—It is well known if a person has an estate *in fee*, that is, the absolute and unconditional possession of it, he can sell or devise it as he thinks proper; but, if he has an estate in tail, he cannot deal with it in this manner. He must first go through certain forms, in order to make himself absolute master of his estate: he must levy a fine, as it is called, which destroys the expectant rights of the issue in tail; or he must, by means of a recovery, get rid of those rights and of all remainders over. But this must be done through the Court of Common Pleas, at certain seasons of the year;—and why, it may be asked, should there exist a necessity for going there? Why force tenants-in-tail into court for mere form's sake? In case of bankruptcy the necessity for these forms is not felt. A trader, who is tenant-in-tail, commits an act of bankruptcy, and, by the assignment under the commission, not only the interest vested in him is conveyed, but all the remainders expectant upon it are destroyed for the benefit of his creditors, and the estate passes to the assignees, free of all restriction. Why, then, may not the possessor of an estate do that for himself which the law permits to be done for an insolvent tradesman and his creditors? So, too, a man and his wife cannot convey an estate of the wife without a fine or a recovery; neither can the wife be barred of her dower without a similar proceeding. There is certainly nothing

very real in a fine, and, as to recoveries, they proceed upon a mere fiction. They go upon the ground of compensation in value being made to the remainder claimants, whose right they cut off, and who, but for this fictitious suit, would have a right to take the estate after the decease of the tenant-in-tail. They are said to recover compensation in value; and from whom do they recover it? Why the common vouchee, who is the *cryer of the court* of Common Pleas, and who, like the man at the Custom-House, obliged to take all the oaths other people do not like, lies groaning under the weight of all the liabilities he has incurred to all the claimants in tail since he became cryer, and answerable for the millions of property, the rights to which, in remainder, have been barred, he not being worth a shilling!

The abolition of these ridiculous forms was recommended upwards of one hundred and fifty years since, and still remains to be enforced by the eloquence of Mr. Brougham. They have no earthly use but to raise money by way of fees; and which, beside creating expense and delay, and oftentimes preventing tenants-in-tail from passing their property by will, which they cannot do if they die before suffering the recovery, they give rise to questions in law, often puzzling, always dilatory and expensive. The mere forms of fines and recoveries cost £70,000 per annum over and above what deeds, operating in the same manner, would cost; and a round sum must be allowed for the litigation which doubts on these assurances are yearly occasioning.

AGREEMENTS FOR LEASES AND CONVEYANCES.—A pregnant source of legal suits is the law with respect to sales, leases, and other conveyances. Thus, if you agree with a person to give him a lease, though he, under the agreement, becomes your tenant, he is your equitable tenant only, but not your legal tenant. He may be possessed of a written agreement, signed and sealed, for a lease of ten years, and may occupy under it, but he has no lease which a court of law can take notice of; and, if an ejectment is brought, he must go out. He may go into a court of equity on his agreement, if that is any comfort to him; he may apply for a decree against you to perform your agreement; but till then his claims are not recognised in a court of common law. If an injunction be brought, the expenses are further multiplied. Why, it may be asked, should not the agreement, such as here described, be as good as a lease; when, in substance, it is the very same thing, and only wants a word added or left out to make it the same in legal effect? A case, illustrative of this subject, happened to Mr. Brougham, on the York circuit. An agreement had been entered into, and possession given; but, because it did not contain words of present demise, it was no lease, and, therefore, the tenant could not stand a moment against the ejectment that was brought, but was driven into the Court of Chancery, where the other party could just as little stand against him. How much inconvenience, expense, and delay, then, might be saved, if such an agreement were pronounced equivalent to a lease!

Again, on the same principle of avoiding multiplicity of suits, why, in ejectments, should two processes be requisite to give the plaintiff his

remedy? As things now stand, after a man has succeeded in one action, and established his title to the possession, he must have recourse to another, to recover that which he ought to have obtained by one and the same verdict that established his title—the mesne profits. Why could not the same jury settle the matter at once? Why is an individual driven to maintain two actions for the purpose of obtaining one and the same remedy? Or why should not the jury that tries the right also assess the damage? Mr. Tennyson's bill, which was intended to remedy some part of this evil, is only permissive; it ought to have been compulsory. It is partial, and it is only recommendatory, and its recommendations are not always attended to, because the lawyers, having the choice, do not think fit to pursue that which is the least profitable; they choose the two actions, when one would suffice for the interests of justice—for the interests of the plaintiff and defendant—for all interests, except those of the practitioners.

ARREST FOR DEBT.—Unless in cases of grossly improvident conduct, or wilful concealment of property from the just claims of creditors, imprisonment of the person for debt, either on mesne process or in execution, seems not defensible. In practice, the power of arrest is often perverted to purposes foreign to its ostensible object. It has been resorted to as a means not of recovering a just claim, but to prevent a just claim being preferred; and the same artifice of a false allegation of debt has been frequently employed to remove a person out of the way who happened to be troublesome, or that some criminal intention might be effected during his incarceration. But, however wicked or spiteful the motives of any one in so employing the process of the law, there being a probable cause of detention, and the process not being abused, no action lies against the wrong doer. If he have no accomplices, so as to fall within the charge of conspiracy, he is safe. To the wealthy all these inconveniences are trivial; but how does such a proceeding operate on a poor man, or a tradesman in moderate circumstances? He has no facilities for obtaining bail; if he does, he pays one way or another afterwards for the favour; and, if he cannot procure it, he must go to prison. And on what ground of common sense does the law in this matter rest? Why should it be supposed that a man, owing twenty pounds, will leave his house, his wife, his children, his country, his pursuits, and incur, voluntarily, the punishment awarded for great crimes, by banishing himself for life? Yet the law always proceeds on the supposition that a man will run away the moment he has notice given him of an action for debt. Some men might possibly act thus, but their conduct forms the exception, not the rule; and it is neither wisdom nor humanity to denounce a penalty against all men in order to meet a case not likely to occur once in a thousand times? Non-payment of debt, if a crime at all, is a crime against property only; and, perhaps, it would be enough to allow property to answer for it: and there is this peculiarity between it and other crimes against property that it is committed with the mutual consent of the parties. Goods sold on credit are mostly charged extra; this extra charge is the premium

exacted by the creditor on account of the risk of repayment; and, having thus fixed the equivalent for his chance of loss, it seems superegratory in the law to grant him, in addition, the power of *ex post facto* punishment, the amount of which he is the sole judge, merely because he has failed in a voluntary adventure, into which he had been tempted to embark, from the prospect of reaping a greater profit than is charged by the ready-money tradesman. Creditors rarely derive any advantage from imprisonment beyond the indulgence of vindictive feeling, which it is inconsistent with the true ends of public law to encourage. Those who do benefit by it are usually the most unfair and ungenerous, who, by a sudden arrest, often embarrass and prejudice all the other parties interested. To the debtor, the consequences are peculiarly hurtful—personal degradation—augmented incapacity and diminished inclination to satisfy his prosecutor—and the contraction of habits inconsistent with future integrity and industry.

INCONSISTENT LIABILITIES OF PROPERTY FOR DEBTS.—In proportion as, before the debt has been proved, the person and property of the party charged should be free from all process not necessary to prevent evasion; so, after judgment, ought the utmost latitude be given to obtain satisfaction from all the defendant's property whatever—land, goods, money, and debts—for to himself they no longer belong. To allow any distinction between one kind of property and another seems the height of injustice. Yet this is of hourly occurrence in the frustration of a creditor after he has obtained judgment, and taken out execution. His debtor has a landed estate; if it be copyhold, the creditor cannot touch it in any way whatever; if it be freehold, he may take half by elegit, and receive the rents and profits, but no more, in the lifetime of his debtor. The debt for which he has received judgment may be such that the rent of the land will not even keep down the interest; still he can take nothing more; he cannot turn the land into money: so that, when a man sues for a thing detained unlawfully, (a horse, for instance,) you give him money which he does not ask; and when he asks for money by suing for a debt, you give him land which he does not want. But if his debtor dies before judgment can be obtained, unless the debt is on bond, he has no remedy at all against any kind of real property of any tenure; nay, though his money, borrowed on note or bill, has been laid out in buying land, the debtor's heir takes that land wholly discharged of the debt.

But not only is land thus sacred from all effectual process of creditors, unless the debtor be a trader: the great bulk of most men's personal property is equally beyond reach of the law. Stock in the public funds—debts due in any manner of way—nay, bank-notes, and even money—are alike protected. A man may owe a hundred thousand pounds in any way, and judgment may have passed against him over and over again; if he have privilege of parliament, live in a furnished house or hotel, and use hired carriages and horses, he may have an income from stock or money lent, of twenty thousand a-year, and defy the utmost efforts of the law; or if he have not privilege, he may live

abroad, or within the Rules, and laugh at all the courts and all the creditors in the country. So absurd are the laws in this respect, that if a person borrow a thousand pounds, and the creditor has obtained judgment, the sheriff's officer appointed to levy upon his personalty may come into his room, and take a table or a desk; but if he sees the identical thousand pounds lying there, he must leave it—he touches it at his peril:—"For this quaint reason," says Lord Mansfield, "because money cannot be sold, and you are required, by the writ, to take your debt out of the produce of goods sold."

Mr. Brougham, in concluding his observations on these barbarous, absurd, and aristocratic laws, eloquently apostrophises—"who is the innovator—he who would adhere to such rules in violation of the manifest intent and spirit of our old law, or he who would re-adjust them so as to give it effect? In ancient times there were none of those masses of property in existence which are exempt from legal process. When the law, therefore, said "Let all a man's goods and chattels be answerable for his debts," it meant to include his whole personalty at the least. Things have now changed in the progress of society; trade has grown up; credit has followed in its train; money, formerly only used as counters, has become abundant; bankers' accounts have been invented; paper currency and the funds have been created. Three-fourths of the debtor's personalty, perhaps nine-tenths, now consist of stock, money, and credit; and the rule of law, which leaves those out of all execution, no longer can mean as before—"Let *all* his personalty be liable"—but "Let a tenth-part of it only be taken." Can there be a greater change made upon, or greater violence done to, the old law itself, than you thus do by affecting to preserve its letter? The great stream of time is perpetually flowing on; all things around us are in ceaseless motion; and we vainly imagine to preserve our relative position among them, by getting out of the current and standing stock still on the margin. The stately vessel we belong to glides down; our bark is attached to it; we might "pursue the triumph, and partake the gale;" but, worse than the fool who stares, expecting the current to flow down and run out, we exclaim—Stop the boat!—and would tear it away to strand it, for the sake of preserving its connexion with the vessel. All the changes that are hourly and gently going on in spite of us, and all those which we ought to make, that violent severances of settled relations may not be effected, far from exciting murmurs of discontent, ought to be gladly hailed as dispensations of a bountiful Providence, instead of filling us with a thoughtless and preposterous alarm."—*On the present State of the Law*, p. 109.

But the imperfect recourse against the debtor's estate, although the grand opprobrium of the debtor-laws, is by no means its only vice: the unequal distribution, in case of insolvency, is scarcely a less notable defect. Only traders, or those who voluntarily take the benefit of the act, are compelled, when insolvent, to make an impartial division of their property. All others may easily, and with impunity, pay one creditor twenty shillings in the pound, and the others sixpence, or

nothing. So, when a man dies insolvent, his representatives may, by acknowledging judgments, secure one creditor his full payment at the expense of all the rest. Thus, lax and impotent as the law is against property, wide as are its loop-holes for fraud and extravagance to escape by, utterly powerless as is its grasp to seize the great bulk of the debtor's possessions, against his *useless person it is powerful and unrelenting*. The argument used is, that the concealed property may thus be wrung from him: the principle, however, of the law, and on which all its provisions are built, is, that the seizure of the body works a satisfaction of the claim; and this satisfaction is given alike in all cases—alike where there is innocent misfortune, culpable extravagance, and guilty embezzlement. “Surely,” says the great Advocate, whose words we are copying, “for all these evils the remedy is easy. Let the whole of every man's property, real and personal—his real, of what kind soever, copyhold, leasehold, freehold; his personal, of whatever nature, debts, money, stock, chattels—be taken for the payment of all his debts equally, and, in case of insolvency, let all be distributed rateably; let all he possesses be sifted, bolted from him unsparingly, until all his creditors are satisfied by payment or composition; but let *his person only be taken when he conceals his goods, or has merited punishment by extravagance or fraud*. This line of distinction is already recognised by the practice of the Insolvent Courts; but the privilege of the Rules is inconsistent with every principle, and ought at once to be abrogated as soon as arrest on mesne process is abolished.”*

INSECURITY OF PROPERTY.—Our aristocratic legislators have always manifested the greatest repugnance to admit the slightest change in existing institutions, under an alleged apprehension it might endanger the security of individual possessions. Nothing, however, can be imagined less secure than the condition of *real property*, as explained by the Law Commissioners, in their report to Parliament. It staggers one to comprehend how the law of any country could get into such a state, or how it has worked or been so long tolerated. The deeds, it seems, are endless, countless, and exceedingly complex, and, after all, do not give a legal title to the subject. A lord chancellor has been heard declare that there was scarcely a *legal title to an estate in England*.† This defect appears to be remedied by a system of trusts, under which every thing, if not actually in the stomach, is at least within the jaws of the great Leviathan of Chancery. Then there seems to be no way in which the exact tenure of any piece of property can be ascertained, except by getting and studying all the deeds which may have ever been executed respecting it. And, after all, a flaw may be overlooked, and a flaw once is a flaw for ever: for time cures little or nothing in a legal title.

* This arrest, the end of which, it is to be hoped, fast approaches, was not generally given by the common law. The *capias ad respondendum* is given in Debt and Detinue, by West. 2 (13 Ed. I.) cap. 11, in case only so late as 19 Hen. VII. c. 9.

† Edinburgh Review, No. 101, p. 129.

LAWS OF MARRIAGE.—The contract of marriage can only be lawfully entered into by strictly complying with certain religious ceremonies. Unless a special license has been obtained, banns must be previously published, and the nuptials must be solemnized in a church or chapel of the establishment, and by a minister of the establishment. These obligations sometimes entail great hardship on parties by whom they have been unintentionally violated. Parents may rear families, and honour them as legitimate, and afterwards discover they have been living in concubinage, and nourishing a spurious offspring, merely from having been mistaken in supposing a priest to have been ordained, or a chapel to have been licensed. No allowance is made even for Dissenters, though their faith is tolerated; they must join in the ritual of the privileged worship, however repugnant to their conscience, on pain of their marriages being invalid. But mark the inconsistency of the law: parties have only to cross the border to Scotland, where marriages may, with impunity, be contracted in contempt of English ceremonies—without publication of banns—or the payment of surplice-fees, and such marriages are recognized as lawful in an English court of justice.*

Another hardship may be mentioned, though it cannot be ascribed to the ecclesiastical monopoly of marriages by the established clergy, but to the decisions of the courts on the law of settlement. The hardship to which we allude is the fact that an English woman, marrying a native of Scotland or Ireland, loses all claim to parochial relief in England, and may be passed, like an Irish or Scotch vagrant, to the birth-place of the husband.—7 *Barnw. & Cress.* 615.

Now, too, that religious disabilities are abrogated, measures ought to be adopted to mitigate the severity of the law in regard to marriages celebrated by Roman Catholic priests: and, in certain cases, to render valid marriages solemnized by ministers of that persuasion. In Ireland, by the law as it now stands, a Catholic priest, in celebrating marriage between a Protestant and Catholic, commits a capital felony, *punishable with death*. By another statute, for the same offence, he is subject to a penalty of £500: so that, agreeably to the observation of a distinguished Irishman, a Catholic priest may be first hanged, and called upon after to pay a fine of £500. The poor Irish, who flock over to this country, from early habit mostly prefer being married by a Catholic priest. Such marriage is invalid, even between two Catholics. The consequence is, the husband may desert his wife when he pleases, and leave his children utterly destitute; for they have no claim on parochial aid in England, not even if they have an English mother.

COSTS OF LAW-SUITS.—It is related, by Swift, of Captain Lemuel Gulliver, that his father was ruined by gaining a law-suit. Notwithstanding the imputed selfishness of mankind, their addiction to litigation is a strong proof of disinterestedness, or at least shows they care less for money than the indulgence of vindictive feeling, or the acknowledgement of an unprofitable right. The doors of courts of justice are

* Lord Stowell's judgment, in *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*.

armed with terrors, threatening destruction to all who enter therein, yet they are beset with applicants for admission. Law, proverbially uncertain, is morally certain of inflicting loss on all parties; for, victor or vanquished, we are sure to be out of pocket. This singular issue results from the rule which allows no more than *taxed costs* to a successful litigant, leaving him to pay the difference between them and the law-charge of his legal adviser. It often happens that a person who sues for a debt of £10 or £15—and the majority of suits are for such diminutive sums—and gains the day, *with costs*—is minus three or fourfold as much for his own share of the expenses. But on this point we shall extract a passage, the first sentence of which we are sure—coming as it does from such high authority—is well worth the ordinary fee of 6s. 8d. to every one with the least disposition to unnecessary litigation. Speaking of the excess of costs which a suitor is obliged to pay his attorney, over and above what he can recover from his antagonist, Mr. Brougham says—

“ This is so certain, and so considerable, that a man shall in vain expect me to recommend him either to bring forward a rightful claim, or to resist an unjust demand for any such sum as twenty, or even thirty pounds—at least, upon a calculation of his interest, I should presently declare to him he had much better say nothing in one case, and pay the money a second time in the other, even if he had a *stamped receipt in his pocket*, provided his adversary were a rich and oppressive man, resolved to take all the advantages the law gives him. I have here before me some samples of taxed bills of costs, taken quite at random, and far from being peculiar cases in any one respect. There is one of £428, made out by a very respectable attorney, and from which the master deducted £202; of this sum, £147 were taken off, which had been paid for bringing witnesses. In this other, amounting to £217, £76 were taxed off; and, in a third, of £63, there were nearly £15 disallowed; it was an undefended cause, to recover £50: had the defendant been obstinate and oppressively inclined, he would have made the extra costs a good deal more than the whole debt, although the suit was in the Exchequer, where the taxation is known to be more liberal. We had lately, in the King’s Bench, a bill of above £100, to recover £19, and probably, of that £100, not above £60 would be allowed. As things now stand, a part of this master evil is inevitable; for, if practitioners were sure of receiving all their bills, they would run up a heavy charge wherever they knew the case to be a clear one. But, as the fundamental principle for which I contend is to alter no part of the law by itself, or without considering all the other parts, there can be no difficulty, consistently with this doctrine, to enlarge the allowance of costs as soon as other amendments have prevented the abuse of litigation by professional men. Some erroneous rules of taxation may, even in a partial or insulated reform, be altered. Whatever is fairly allowed, as between attorney and client, should be allowed between party and party, except only such needless charges as have been ordered expressly by the client himself. There can surely be no reason for disallowing, as a general rule, all consultations, often absolutely necessary for the conduct of a cause, generally more beneficial than much that is allowed; nor can it be right, that so little of the expense of bringing evidence should be given, and that the cost of preparing the case, by inquiries, journeys, &c. should be refused altogether. The necessary consequence of not suffering an attorney to charge what he ought to receive for certain things, is that he is *driven to do a number of needless things*, which he knows are always allowed as a matter of course, and the expense is thus increased to the client far beyond the mere gain which the attorney derives from it.”

Thus it appears attorneys are placed in a similar predicament to what

medical men were, prior to Lord Tenterden's decision in their favour, when they were compelled to seek a remuneration for attendance on their patients, through the medium of unnecessary draughts, or exorbitant charges for drugs. It is due, indeed, to the respectable part of the legal profession to say that they are not entirely to blame for the monstrous bills they deliver to their clients. A shameful system of extortion prevails in the courts, and many of the fees exacted by the officers, during the see-saw of a cause, can be considered nothing but legalized robbery of the suitor. In the Common Pleas, the prothonotaries charge 8*d.* per folio of seventy-two words, on all pleadings entered; and, if the declaration and issue, or declaration and judgment, be of different terms, the 8*d.* is doubled. In the King's Bench, 4*d.* per folio is charged. The entry, by them so called, is, in fact, nothing more than *imprinting a stamp* by a clerk in the office; the attorney performing the drudgery of engrossing or entering the proceedings on the roll. The charges for passing records and setting down causes are a grievous burthen. They are passed by an officer, whose clerk charges from 30*s.* and upwards. If the cause is not tried on the day on which it is set down, the marshal must be paid for his deputy *marking the cause* as a remanet; for the first of which he charges 6*s.* and for all after the first 4*s.* After the holidays, a fee of 10*s.* 6*d.*, 6*s.* 8*d.*, or 3*s.* 4*d.* according to usage, is extorted, at each office, for opening them. All these court-fees tend to swell an attorney's bill, though he has advanced the money for them, as well as the lawyer's fee, out of his own pocket.

LAW OF DEBTOR AND CREDITOR.—If there was any country in which a man, in order to recover a debt of £6 or £7, must begin by expending £60 or £70—where, at the outset, he had to run the risk of throwing so much good money after bad—it would at once be said that, whatever other benefits or advantages that country enjoyed, at least it was not fortunate in its system of law. But if it were added that, in addition to spending £60 or £70, a man must endure great difficulties, anxiety, and uncertainty, infinite bandying to and fro, and moving about from province to province, and from court to court, before he could obtain judgment, then our envy of the country, where such administration of the law existed, would be further diminished. And if, in addition to all this, after expending £60 or £70, in looking after the recovery of £6 or £7, a man's adversary should have the power of keeping his property out of the way, and beyond reach, so that, after all, the plaintiff should not receive some part of his debt, the case would be still worse. And further, in addition to this, if, in the same country, in cases where a man was so circumstanced as to be able to recover and receive his debt, and where the debtor was solvent, and prepared to pay, the individual should receive, it was true, his £6 or £7, but should not receive the whole £60 or £70, which he had spent in costs, although there was judgment in his favour, but should receive the amount wanting £20, so that he should have spent £13 or £14 out of his pocket, over and above the amount of the debt which he recovered, after being exposed to a variety of plagues, and the annoyances of these

proceedings; if he were told of such a case, would not the natural inquiry be, "Whether it was possible that such a country existed?"—We should immediately pronounce that, if so, it must be in a most barbarous state; that it must be a poor country, for no commercial country, having interests extensive and important, would endure such a state of things. Nevertheless, the country where this state of things exists is that in which we now live—England!*

This pointed and forcible delineation of the working of the debtor-laws—indisputably the worst in Europe—will be readily comprehended from our previous illustrations. It is the substance—the bare bone and muscle—of a splendid passage in Mr. Brougham's second great philippic on legal abuses. The abilities of this extraordinary man have raised him to the first rank of his profession, and few profit more than he does by existing defects; yet it is to him, next to Bentham and Romilly—posterior in time, but hardly in power—the country is mainly indebted for the reforms in progress, and the improvements which must, ere long, be introduced through the entire system of judicial administration.

ABSURDITIES AND DELAYS IN JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION.

Magna Charta says that justice shall neither be denied, sold, nor delayed. With the single exception of guarding the country from foreign aggression, the only object for which governments have been instituted is the administration of justice. It is to attain this end that all taxes and contributions from the people were originally intended. They were not meant to support useless placemen and pensioners, nor to maintain standing armies, nor to defray the interests of debts contracted in unnecessary wars; but to protect every individual in the community from oppression. Justice ought not only to be speedy, but, above all things, cheap. To render the expense of legal process exorbitant, is not delaying—it is absolutely denying justice to all but the rich: it is affording the protection of the law to those least in need of its aid, and refusing it to those most exposed to oppression.

In England, justice is not only delayed, but, from its dearness, often unattainable. These evils result from causes much too numerous and complex to be here specified; but the most palpable appear to be the unequal distribution of business in the several courts of law—the consumption of the time of the judges in matters either irrelevant or derogatory to their more important functions—the monopoly of practice vested in different classes of practitioners—the retention of useless, absurd, and antiquated forms of procedure—the confusion, obscurity, and inconsistencies in the laws themselves—and, in short, from the entire fabric of judicial administration being inadequate and unsuitable to the wants of the age, and only adapted to a state of society wholly different from that which now exists.

To point out the manifold absurdities of the legal system we shall make no pretension; still we cannot help noticing the more striking anomalies.

* Mr. Brougham, House of Commons, April 29, 1830.

If, for example, twelve judges were necessary to administer justice, centuries ago, why not nearly double the number at the present? Consider the augmentation in wealth and population; consider the increase of lawyers, attornies, criminals, and suitors; why not a corresponding increase in judges? But then there were only twelve apostles to preach the gospel, therefore there must be only twelve judges to preach the law. What a reason for John Bull—yet he swallows it.*

If circuits have been gradually altered from septennial to annual, and from annual to twice in a year, and three times in the home circuit, why not go on? Why not have gaol deliveries as frequently in the country as in London? Why should a man be confined six months before trial in Yorkshire, and only six weeks in London? Why, again, should a person, charged with an offence in one part of the metropolis, be imprisoned only four or five weeks, while, under precisely similar circumstances in another part, he is imprisoned two or three months? Are we never to have uniformity in justice—are the claims of common sense to be for ever stifled by the logic of lawyers, the allegations of custom, antiquity, and local usage?

If the lord-chief-justice requires three or four assistants, why not a lord chancellor similar aid? Does it require more grave deliberation to adjudicate trumpety suits of £10 or £15 than suits which can never be commenced for less than £100? Does it require a greater mass of collective wisdom to administer a written, fixed, and known law than one only inscribed on sand—remarkable for complexity—often to fabricate on the spur of the occasion—and having no immutable standard beyond the varying conscience and intelligence of the judge? Shame on the legislature, which tolerates, year after year, a system so repugnant to reason!

If it be necessary to have circuits to administer common law, why not equity? This is the practice in some of the states of North America; and why should not the precedent be followed, although the people of those countries be so deplorably unfortunate as neither to have an established Church nor Aristocracy!

If the evidence of a Gentoo, a Jew, or a Turk may be received in judicial administration, why should the judges suffer the ends of justice to be defeated by rejecting the testimony of an Englishman who happens not to believe in the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, but who is assuredly as good a Christian as the infidels we have mentioned?

Why should justices of peace, in quarter sessions, have such great power over the person and none over property? Is it a less serious thing to transport a poor man from his country, his wife, and his children, for fourteen years, than to decide a few pounds' debt, a trespass, tort, or other civil injury? If the country magistracy are not

* *Better late than never*—last Session an additional judge was added to each of the three superior courts of King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, but the augmentation, we apprehend, is not commensurate to the wants of the community.

learned enough to administer the laws of property, why not simplify them? or, why not let them have the aid of an assistant barrister, and thereby expedite justice, save enormous expense to suitors, and lighten the pressure of business at the assizes? Would not this be a more practicable and economical improvement in domestic jurisprudence than the introduction of an entirely new machinery of local tribunals, as a great, but, as we humbly think, in this point, a mistaken man, has recently proposed?

Again: the meaning of wills, bonds, and other legal instruments being of such vast importance, why are they not punctuated and drawn up according to the ordinary rules of composition, to prevent misapprehension? Is the contrary course followed as more conducive to obscurity and litigation?

Lastly, we may inquire, why do attornies and solicitors delay their suits and impoverish their clients by cramming their briefs into the bags of what are called king's counsel, or leading counsel, who are so overwhelmed with business that they have seldom time to read them—to master the law respecting them—or be present in court when the cause comes on, while there are hundreds of worthy men at the bar, with leisure, talent, and industry, but failing opportunity, name, or connexion, are condemned to penury and obscurity? Are lawyers all ARISTOCRATS; are they like the rich clergy, without bowels for the more unfortunate brethren of their own order?

These are a few of the incongruities in the administration of justice which present themselves to the contemplation of an impartial observer. But the Court of Chancery is unquestionably the least defensible part of our judicial system, and the most pregnant in abuse and delay. Before this tribunal a cause may be pending for years, and, even after it has been gone through, and is so far matured as to be what the lawyers call *ripe for decision*, it may wait three years for judgment. Mr. Williams relates a singular instance of dilatoriness in this court: the suit involved considerable property, of which part was a windmill.* A bill was filed in 1703; in 1796, the cause had progressed as far as the master's office, where it was stationary till 1815, when it was found, on inquiry, the windmill had disappeared, and there was no longer any trace of its existence. Time, it seems, had been at work, while equity was sleeping. The immense mass of property locked up in chancery almost exceeds belief. In the year 1756, the amount of suitors' effects fell short of three millions; in 1829, they had accumulated to £38,886,135.† Of this enormous sum there is more than one-third which, from the procrastinated delay of suits, should either have belonged to persons deceased without representatives, or persons living, but ignorant, from the books not being open to them, of their claims altogether, or, if acquainted with their claims, ignorant in what manner or names their property is vested.

Now, to people living out of the atmosphere of corruption and in-

* House of Commons, Delays in Chancery, Feb. 24, 1824.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 282, Session 1830.

trigue, there appears little difficulty in suggesting remedies for this monstrous oppression. 1. By separating the political from the judicial character of the lord chancellor, and clothing him with independence in the exercise of his legal functions, which is considered so great an excellence in the *status* of the common-law judges. 2. By separating the appellate jurisdiction in the House of Lords, and abolishing the monstrous absurdity of appeals from the lord chancellor on the bench to the lord chancellor on the woolsack. 3. By the relieving of his lordship of his duties in bankruptcies, which is the most reasonable, since the exercise of jurisdiction therein is comparatively of recent occurrence.* 4. By creating, if need be, an additional equity judge. Lastly, by a thorough reform in the offices of the masters and registrars.

These reforms have been recommended over and over again by Mr. M. A. Taylor, Mr. John Williams, and others; and the only reasons we could ever discover why they have not been adopted may be comprised in a very small compass. Our readers are aware what a tempting acquisition the see of Canterbury is to all aspiring churchmen; and what an itching the Philpotts and Blomfields have to clutch the magnificent revenues and patronage of the arch-diocese. Well, what Lambeth is in the Church, the Chancellorship is at the Bar. It is the glittering prize of ambitious, intriguing, and time-serving lawyers; it is the goal of desire to all gentlemen of the long robe, for every one has more or less confidence in his good fortune and abilities, and few but hope to reach it at last. Hence there is little prospect of effective reform in equity, while law-craft is so predominant in the legislature. The Court of Chancery cannot be reformed without dividing the power, the patronage, and emoluments of the judge who presides there. Merely to separate the bankruptcies would take four or five thousand pounds per annum out of the pockets of the lord chancellor, and £1200 a-year out of the pockets of his clerk. Hence the evasions and sluggishness of his Lordship; hence the silence and backwardness of all those—and they are a host—who aspire to his office, or look up to him for countenance and preferment.

Our readers need not be apprehensive we shall keep them *long in chancery*: we have done with the subject; our object has been to give them an idea of this great judicial nuisance, and the reasons why it has not been long since abated. Our prayer is that the Duke of Wellington, without regarding legal sophistry, speech-making, or subterfuge, will speedily apply his shrewd and resolute common sense to the reform of this national grievance, and there will be an end of it, as there is of the beer-monopoly and religious disabilities.

OPPRESSIONS UNDER THE EXCISE-LAWS.

We have already made some remarks on the multiplicity and inquisitorial nature of the Revenue-Laws. Excise informations, of which we are going to give some account, are the practical consequences of these laws.

* The power of the lord chancellor to adjudicate in bankruptcy was granted by a statute of Henry VIII. but it was never exercised till the time of Lord Chancellor Nottingham.

These informations are filed in the Court of Exchequer for real or supposed frauds on the revenue. The prosecutions are almost invariably instituted either on the testimony of hired spies or the Excise-officers. They form a principal source of emolument to the law-officers of the Crown. Every prosecution costs the country about fifty guineas. Of this sum, ten guineas are for a brief to the Attorney-General; to the Solicitor-General, ten guineas; to two counsel, eight guineas each; to two other counsel, four guineas each. And to these sums must be added another item of £7:13:6 for the court-crier. Let the case be ever so simple, this is the usual array of counsel which appears for the Crown; and against which the accused has to contend. In one year, there have been no less than 761 informations under the Excise-Laws; and the law-expenses on each case were not less than £120, making an annual sum of more than £120,000. The nature of these proceedings will be best illustrated by examples, selected from many others, which have been brought before the Parliament.

The first case we shall mention is that of Jeremiah Abell, a small farmer, in Norfolk. This man was prosecuted by the Excise for penalties to the amount of £1000, on account of an alleged smuggling transaction. He was able to prove, most distinctly, by seventeen witnesses, against the single testimony of the informer, that he was thirty miles from the place where the offence was sworn to have been committed. When the case was tried, his counsel most unaccountably consented to compromise the matter with the Board for £300, contrary to the express injunction of the defendant. Afterwards, the matter slept for a year, when Mr. Abell was taken into custody; and, at the time his case was mentioned in the House, he had been confined sixteen months in Norwich gaol. Of his innocence there could not be the slightest doubt. He had the most satisfactory evidence to prove that the informer was at Norwich at the very time he had sworn to have been thirty miles from that place, watching the defendant and six others engaged in smuggling.

Mr. Henty, another sufferer, and a most respectable gentleman of Sussex, had a very narrow escape from a gang of wretches patronised and employed by the Excise. He was found guilty of an attempt to defraud the revenue, and sentenced to pay fines and costs to the amount of £2400. The evidence on which he was convicted was of the most infamous description; and such as none but the agents of an odious system would ever think of employing. One of them was accused of an atrocious murder at Greenwich; others were afterwards convicted of perjury; some transported for robbery; and others (there being seven witnesses in all) we believe, were hanged. The conduct of the Excise in this case was the more unjustifiable, because they had been apprised of the characters of these miscreants: nevertheless, the solicitor commenced his prosecution against Mr. Henty, and, on their evidence, he was found guilty. When an indictment for perjury was preferred, the Excise came forward, and offered bail for them; and no doubt they would have absconded, and Mr. Henty been deprived of all means of proving his innocence, had they not been committed to prison on a charge of felony.

A great number of informations have been filed apparently for no other motive than to obtain heavy costs from individuals, and add to the enormous emoluments of the law-officers of the Crown. A case of this description was brought forward by Mr. D. W. Harvey. An information was laid against a merchant for retailing a certain vegetable powder, of the illegality of which the accused was wholly ignorant. The penalty was £100. The merchant memorialized the Board; admitted that such a powder had been sold, but protested his ignorance that the practice was unlawful; and prayed that the commissioners would investigate the case, and mete out such a punishment as the offence deserved. In answer to this, he received a private circular, which, among other things, said that "the petition makes no offers; and, as the Board has already ordered proceedings, it cannot now stay them, *there being no offer to pay fine or costs, or both.*" The merchant reiterated his memorial, offering £10, which was refused; but in lieu, no other sum was suggested: he was merely told that it could not be accepted. He then made an offer of £20, which was also negatived, but with a *hint* that £30, with an agreement to pay costs, would be accepted. On this intimation, the gentleman was induced to inquire of the solicitor of Excise what would be the probable amount of costs. He was told £60 or £70; so that, though there was no wilful violation of the law on the part of this individual, he was compelled either to pay the full penalty of £100, or, which amounted to the same thing, £70 costs, and a composition of £30.

The solicitor not condescending to give any explanation of the £60 or £70 costs, the party proceeded to try the case; and that being almost an admitted one, it might have been supposed that one counsel and one witness would have been sufficient. This, however, would not have answered the interests of the legal establishment of the Crown. To conduct the prosecution, five counsel were retained. These five counsel were an expense of £50 at least. There were other expenses attending the examination of witnesses, &c. but this was not enough: a special jury must needs be summoned to try a man for a crime he had acknowledged; a common jury might have done, but then only three counsel would have been requisite: a special jury rendered five necessary. It is in this way that tradesmen are frequently reduced to beggary, in order to enrich, with fees, the Crown lawyers. However clear the accusation may be, the Attorney and Solicitor General, two king's counsel, and a junior counsel, are always employed for the prosecution; and the costs usually amount to not less than £150. The solicitor for the Excise, in these matters, has almost unlimited power, and exercises the function of both judge and jury. The petitions that are sent to the Board are referred to him; and which, for the sake of his own emolument, it is generally his interest to reject.

Frequently, Excise prosecutions originate in the conspiracies of base miscreants, who, for the sake of the reward, or to gratify their malice, unite to ruin particular individuals. As an instance of this sort, we select the following:—A man took a range of obscure and dilapidated buildings, in London, for the pretended purpose of becoming a brewer of

ale, and immediately set to work to draw honest tradesmen into his snares. By an act of parliament, a penalty is imposed on those who sell treacle or molasses to brewers. This miscreant, to accomplish his purpose, used to frequent those shops which were left under the superintendence of apprentices and children; he procured a small quantity of these articles to be sent to him, and then gave information that the parties had sold them to a licensed brewer. Another case of the same stamp:—A respectable and industrious tradesman of Colchester, Mr. Underwood, had, on some account or other, incurred the hatred of a notorious smuggler, who made a vow that, by some means he would accomplish his destruction. This, he thought, could not be more effectually done than by putting him in the hands of the Excise. He accused Mr. Underwood of being engaged in a contraband trade. Two informations were filed in the Exchequer; one for the condemnation of Mr. Underwood's vessel, the other to recover the penalty of the bond which all masters enter into not to be concerned in any smuggling transaction. When the case came to be heard, the smuggler admitted that the information was false and malicious, and, of course, Mr. Underwood was acquitted; but he had incurred expenses to the amount of £327 in triumphing over the malice of his enemy. He had no redress for his loss; and his only resource was to commence an unprofitable prosecution against the smuggler for perjury. At the same place, a brewer, having lent a friend his copper, was prosecuted for that friend's brewing a quarter of malt. The penalty for his *friendship* was £100; and the first intimation of it being incurred was an appalling bill of forty or fifty folios in length. He applied to the Board, who consented to remit the penalty, provided he paid £30, and what *small* costs might have been incurred in the prosecution. Three months after, he received a bill from a solicitor, in which these small costs were charged £46.

Persons are frequently dragged into the Court of Exchequer without knowing for what offence, when it had been committed, nor who is the informer. In the case of Mr. Waithman, a handkerchief was brought into his house, not worth thirty shillings, by a person in his employ, at the solicitation of a friend in the country. An information was laid against him, and a penalty of £200 demanded, which was afterwards softened down to £100, as a particular favour to the worthy alderman.

We will only mention one more case of Exchequer process; that of a Captain Bryan. This gentleman was called on for a penalty of £200, two years after he thought the transaction had been entirely settled. On a petition to the Board, the penalty indeed was remitted; but a bill of costs was brought forward by the solicitor to a nearly equal amount. The misfortune of this gentleman originated in mistake in the report of the ship's cargo. The error was explained to the commissioners of Excise, who appeared perfectly satisfied, and the Captain concluded the matter was at an end. Two years were suffered to elapse, when the unsuspecting Captain was surprised with an Exchequer process, showing that an action had commenced against him to recover the penalty for the infraction of the Excise-Laws. The Captain, as we

have said, petitioned; the penalty was remitted: but the solicitor brought in his bill of costs to the amount of £160:5, and his own solicitor's costs amounted to £89:5:9 more.

Another evil resulting from the Excise system is the power vested in the Commissioners of Excise or Lords of the Treasury to mitigate penalties or stay proceedings against offenders at their discretion. This enables them to make the most odious distinction between persons supposed to be friendly or hostile to the Borough System. We had a singular instance of this in the case of Mr. ABBOTT, brewer and magistrate, of Canterbury. This man had, for a long time, been selling, according to Mr. Brougham's statement, *rank poison* in the beverage of the people. It appears he had been selling a liquor resembling beer, manufactured from beer-grounds, distillers' spent wash, quassia, opium, guinea pepper, vitriol, and other deleterious and poisonous ingredients. The officers of Excise having examined this worthy magistrate's premises, found 12 lbs. of prepared powder, and 14 lbs. of vitriol, or copperas, in boxes, which, if full, would have contained 56 lbs. Proceedings were instituted against him by the Board. The penalties he had incurred amounted to £9000; and the case being notorious and atrocious, the Commissioners appeared determined to levy them with rigour. Mr. Abbott, however, was a *loyal man* and an *active magistrate*; and he prevailed upon some other loyal men to write on his behalf to the Lords of the Treasury. Among other persons who stepped forward in behalf of this *virtuous* magistrate, were the very reverend the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Gerard Andrewes, Mr. Baker, M.P. and the late Sir William Curtis. All these were loyal men and true; and, in their letters to the Lords of the Treasury, spoke in the highest terms of the public and private virtues of the *good* Mr. Abbott. Mr. Baker styles him "my much esteemed and valued friend, Mr. Abbott." Sir William Curtis was still more eloquent and touching; stating that he was a very long acquaintance of fifty years, and a "most honourable and virtuous old man." The reverend Dean went on in the same strain; stating that he was a "*good neighbour* of his, and an useful magistrate;" and that he should regret were his "usefulness and respectability diminished by a matter that concerned ONLY ALE-DRINKERS!"

But only think of this! Here is a man, a very reverend dean, who regrets that a *good neighbour of his* should be dragged before the public, merely for poisoning *ale-drinkers*. Had Mr. Abbott been poisoning *wine-drinkers*, we imagine his crime would have appeared very different in the eyes of the reverend dean. It is related of a right reverend bishop, in the House of Lords, that he once remarked that he did not know what the people had to do with the laws but to obey them. One is at a loss to conceive where these notions have been taken up; they certainly belong to another age, or at least to another country than England. For our part, we can only ascribe this unseemly insolence of the clergy to the undeserved respect which they have been accustomed to receive from the people, and which has begotten in them a feeling of superiority to which, above all men, they

have the least claim, either on account of their knowledge or virtues, or any other qualification useful or ornamental. The views of some of them in respect of the people are very little more elevated than those of the nobles of Russia towards their boors. We remember an anecdote of a Russian officer travelling through Germany, who, on account of a trifling delay or provocation, shot his postilion. The circumstance exciting some noise, the officer was given to understand that, though such things might do very well in Russia, they could not pass in Germany with impunity. The officer, considering the interruption impertinent, demanded the *price* of a German postilion, and said he would *pay for him*. This was not much worse than Dr. Andrewes's notion of the social importance of ale-drinkers.

To return, however, to the *good* Mr. Abbott: so many testimonies, from such quarters, to his various excellences were not to be neglected. The Treasury, without seeking any more evidence, but merely at the instigation of their political friends, ordered the proceedings to be stayed, and penalties to the amount of £9000 were softened down to £500.

The cases we have cited will, we apprehend, be sufficient to exemplify the nature of Excise informations. The proceedings of the Court of Star Chamber, of the Inquisition in Spain, or *Lettres de Cachette* in France, were not more diabolical and oppressive than those which often occur in this country to uphold an oppressive system of taxation. Much of the evil results from the endeavours of the Aristocracy to throw a disproportionate share of public burthens on the industrious classes by taxing heavily all articles of general consumption. Tea, spirits, and tobacco are the chief articles in which frauds on the revenue are attempted; and these are respectively taxed 100, 520, and 900 per cent. on the cost price. It is the high amount of duties which renders smuggling and adulteration so profitable that all attempts to suppress them prove unavailing. Three-fourths of the whole quantity of tobacco consumed in Ireland is smuggled;* and one-third of the tea sold in England is the produce of adulteration. What blessed effects are these of our fiscal regulations; especially coupled with the fact that the coast-guard for the prevention of smuggling alone costs the country £700,000 per annum.

PROSPECTS OF LEGAL REFORM.

England is not less a law-ridden than a priest-ridden country; and we regret that Mr. Brougham cannot devise plans of reform having a less tendency to increase the number and emolument of a profession already too predominant. It has been remarked, by Mr. Bentham, that lawyers oppose improvement from the same motives workmen oppose the introduction of machinery,—they *are apprehensive it would lessen their employment*. Undoubtedly it would have this effect; for the great object sought to be attained is to simplify and expedite judicial proceedings: by which, unnecessary delay and expense may be avoided. Mr. Roscoe, in his *Life of Leo X.* (vol. iv. p. 179.)

* Sir Henry Parnell on Financial Reform, p. 49.

relates an anecdote of that pontiff which is applicable both to the law and priestcraft of this country:—Cardinal Bembo having, on one occasion, quoted a passage from the Evangelists, he was interrupted by his Holiness, who said “It is well known to all ages how profitable this *fable of Christ* has been to us.”—Our lawyers may say the same: the cart-load of legendary rubbish they profess to expound is, doubtless, very profitable to them, but a serious loss and inconvenience to society.

It by no means follows, because there are laws, there should be a host of legalists to interpret them. The causes which render English laws difficult and unintelligible are obvious, and have been explained. It arises from their multiplicity, their contradictions, and the uncouth and nonsensical jargon in which they are expressed. All these are defects which would be speedily obviated by a government that represented the mind, the wants, and interests of the community. The Statute-Book, and the mass of decisions engrafted upon it, we verily believe, might be compressed into an octavo volume, and rendered so plain and readable as to form an appropriate class-book in every seminary of education in the kingdom. Sad calamity this for the gentlemen of the bar! Their occupation would be curtailed; their wigs and gowns cease to be venerable; and all their learned lore be as much out of date as the cocked hats and ruffles of the last generation. Can we wonder, therefore, at their hostility to improvement? They have a great stake—not in the country, but the law; and we may generally reckon upon them for our opponents: though it is rather too much that they should accuse (as some of them do) the reformers of being irrational and visionary, while their own mountebank profession is the reverse of both reason and common sense.

Between juriconsults in this country and on the Continent there is a marked difference: by the latter, law has long been treated as a rational science; by the former, it is considered nothing more than a mass of precedents, conundrums, forms, and technicalities—an art or mystery by dabbling in which men may soon become rich. A few splendid exceptions there are, no doubt, to this description; but this is the general character of the fraternity; their object is to gather fees, not study the principles of jurisprudence. Hence it is not from the profession we anticipate a systematic and effective reform in our judicial administration;—though, if any unlearned person venture to suggest improvements, the whole craft is in arms, and ready to devour him. So far as the practice of the profession is concerned, lawyers are the fittest persons to expound it; but so far as regards any thing new,—a code, for instance, or a different mode of administering justice,—they are the last persons in the world who ought to be consulted. For our parts, we should as soon think of advising with the disciples of IGNATIUS LOYOLA about the institutions of the order of Jesuits as with lawyers on the subject of legal reform.

Yet it is to lawyers the great work of legal amendment is confided, and from them alone are the people to expect reform in our judicial system. Nothing but disappointment, we fear, will flow from this

source. All the law-lords are opposed to reform of any sort, with the exception of Lords Lyndhurst and Plunket, and these, either from interests at stake and indolence, or personal disappointment, are not expected to lend efficient aid. Sir James Scarlett has suggested some minor improvements; but it is evident he views, with no favourable eye, innovations on the great field of his triumphs. Only think of this gentleman's defence of *special pleading*, the absurdities of which are enough to make a horse laugh; a drizzling maze of empyrical inventions, circuitous procedure, and unintelligible fiction, calculated for no purpose but to fortify monopoly and wrap justice in deceit and mystery. With such obstacles and prejudices what can be anticipated but delay and evasion without end, and ultimate failure at last?

The Common-Law Commissioners are not expected to conclude their inquiries in less than three years, and the Commissioners of Inquiry on the Laws of Real Property in less than twelve years.* At the expiration of these periods what may be expected? The accumulation of innumerable volumes of reports, and the useful suggestions they contain, buried in as impenetrable a mass as the laws whose abuses they are meant to set forth; and, after all this expenditure of time, labour, and money, it is probable no measures of reform will be founded upon them. They will share the fate of the Chancery Report, made five years ago, of the volumes without number of Reports on Public Charities, on the state of Ireland, the state of the finances, the poor, and other national subjects, in which there is much research and many useful suggestions, but they are never reduced to practice.

Next let us advert to the reformatory labours of the Secretary of State. The consolidation acts of Sir Robert Peel are, no doubt, improvements; but the progress of the Right Hon. Gentleman is much too dilatory, and his plan of proceeding deficient in comprehensiveness. The entire body of criminal law ought to have been taken up at once by a select body of individuals competent to the undertaking, and digested into a simple and uniform code, accessible and intelligible to the whole community. Granting, some thirty years hence, Sir Robert may have finished his task, still it appears to us the criminal laws will be in as great a state of obscurity, contradiction, and perplexity as at present. We shall cite an example, from the Forgery Act of last session, to illustrate the working of this partial legislation.

In the twenty-third section of the act it is provided that the punishments of the 5 Eliz. c. 14, so far as they have been adopted by *other acts*, shall be repealed, and other punishments substituted in lieu of them. Now, as these *other acts* remain on the statute-book, without reference to the 1 Will. IV. c. 66, by which they have been altered, how is it possible this fact should be known to any person who happens to refer to them? This appears to us a convincing proof of the perplexities which will pervade the criminal statutes after the process of consolidation has been completed. They will be a sealed book, as heretofore, to all but lawyers and judges: in short, the legislature

* Law Magazine for January, 1830.

appears to proceed on the principle that laws are framed for the benefit of the profession only, not for the people; but surely the penal code, which affects every member of society, ought to be constituted for a very different purpose. Again, how little is the advantage of consolidating the statutes, if the decisions engrafted upon them, and which are as valid a portion of the law as the statutes themselves, are not incorporated? It will be all labour in vain, and "confusion worse confounded!"

In our humble opinion a different course might be pursued with advantage in the great work of legal reform. In the first place, it appears to us inquiries are not so much needed as remedies; abuses in our judicial system are not far to seek—they are obvious, and so are the means of reforming them. Why, then, not dispense with those voluminous reports and endless researches? A commission might have been appointed to consolidate and simplify the criminal law—another the civil law—another the law of property—and another the laws which regulate civil and criminal procedure, and each commission might not only have incorporated the statutes relative to the several departments of jurisprudence, but also the decisions of the judges founded upon them, and which have become part of the law of the land. When each commission had finished its task, their labours might have received the fiat of the legislature. It is only, we imagine, by some such measures the laws of England can ever be made worthy of the enlightened community for whose benefit they are intended.

But it is high time we concluded this long article. When the first Common-Law Report was presented to the Duke of Wellington, his only remark is said to have been—"Too much of it,—too much of it,—a d——d deal too much of it." We fear a remark of the same tenor may escape some of our readers, owing to the prolixity of our lucubrations. But the importance of the subject must form our apology. The dearness and delay of justice are national grievances of long standing. It appears, from *Whitlocke's Memorials*, Oliver Cromwell presented a petition to the Collective Wisdom of his day, praying that "a speedy consideration might be had of the great oppressions, by reason of the multiplicity of unnecessary laws, with their intricacies and delays, which tend to the profit of some particular men, but much to the expense and damage of the whole." The Lord Protector, later in life, triumphed over every difficulty; but the lawyers gave him most trouble, and he was constrained at last to acknowledge they were too many for him.

* * The subjoined statements are principally abstracted from Returns to Parliament last session, and will confirm and illustrate the preceding exposition of our judicial administration. In some of the documents we have left out the shillings and pence to save room, which makes some trifling inaccuracies in the summing up.

JUDGES' SALARIES.

SALARY and ALLOWANCES received, in the Year 1792, by each of the JUDGES of the Exchequer, King's Bench, and Court of Common Pleas; and the Salary and Allowances paid in 1829.

	1792.	1829.
KING'S BENCH:	£	£
Chief Justice	4,000	10,000
Puisne Judges, each	2,400	5,500*
COMMON PLEAS:		
Chief Justice	3,500	8,000
Puisne Judges, each	2,400	5,500
EXCHEQUER:		
Chief Baron	3,500	7,000
Barons, each	2,400	5,500†

In addition to the Salaries and Allowances paid in 1792, the Judges of the several Courts were remunerated by Fees, the amount of which, received by each, is not known. The Judges derive no emolument from such source at present.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

RETURN of the Total Amount of the Effects of the Suitors of the Court of Chancery, in the Years 1756 to 1829 inclusive.

	£	s.	d.
In the year 1756 the total amount of suitors' effects was	2,864,975	16	1
In the year 1766 the total amount	4,019,004	19	4
In the year 1776 the total amount	6,602,229	8	6
In the year 1786 the total amount	8,848,535	7	11
In the year 1796 the total amount	14,550,397	2	0
In the year 1806 the total amount	21,922,754	12	8
In the year 1816 the total amount	31,953,890	9	5
In the year 1818 the total amount	33,534,520	0	10
In the year 1819 the total amount	32,848,815	13	4
In the year 1820 the total amount	33,258,897	17	11
In the year 1821 the total amount	34,693,735	10	10
In the year 1822 the total amount	35,683,034	5	6
In the year 1823 the total amount	36,988,481	12	9
In the year 1824 the total amount	37,635,924	13	0
In the year 1825 the total amount	38,224,834	18	4
In the year 1826 the total amount	38,223,602	0	1
In the year 1827 the total amount	38,060,055	4	1
In the year 1828 the total amount	38,266,438	9	10
In the year 1829 the total amount	38,386,135	19	5

* In addition to these salaries, the second judge of the King's Bench receives an ancient fee of £10 per term, or £40 per annum, in respect of his labour in giving charge to the grand jury, and pronouncing judgment against mafefactors; payable out of the fines, forfeitures, penalties, and compositions in the Court of King's Bench.

† The Chief Baron and Barons of the Court of Exchequer receive, in addition to the above salaries, an annual allowance of £17:10:8 for stationery, payable, by the Usher of the Exchequer, out of annual grants of parliament.

SUITORS' EFFECTS—CHANCERY EMOLUMENTS. 291

AN ACCOUNT of the several Fees or Sums of Money received in the Office of the Lord Chancellor's SECRETARY for COMMISSIONS of BANKRUPT, from the 1st of April, 1829, to the 31st of March, 1830, inclusive.

	Total Received.	Lord Chancellor.	Secretary, Deputy, and Clerks.
	£	£	£
949 Town commissions	1898	1043	854
1267 Country commissions	2090	1393	696
210 Dockets not acted upon	341	341
67 Renewed commissions	40	40	
40 Re-sealed commissions	29	29	
166 Supersedeas's	286	120	166
For filing affidavits relating to super- sedeas's	17	17	
977 Certificates	1343	1221	122
For extra affidavits and powers of attorney on certificates	242	242	
757 Petitions answered for hearing	510	473	37
76 Motion-papers, in the nature and to the effect a petition, filed for the purpose of grounding an order or proceeding thereon	51	47	3
127 Petitions of course	79	79	
492 Copies of minutes of orders, made at the request of the parties	86	86
943 Orders, attending the hearing, taking minutes, drawing up, engrossing, and entering at length in the order- book	1202	1202
(If more than 16 folios, 3d. per folio for extra length, being the actual expense.)			
For office-copies of orders, &c.	44	44
For office-copies of affidavits, inclu- ding office-copies of reports and certificates, and all other copies not before specified	1725	1725
For filing 182 declarations of insol- vency	18	18
182 Warrants for advertising same in Ga- zette	22	22
Filing 14 certificates of unclaimed dividends	1	1
For searches	290	290
	<u>10,320</u>	<u>4708</u>	<u>5612</u>
Deducting, from the fees above stated as payable to the Lord Chancellor, the salary allowed by his lordship to his secretary		400	
		<u>4308</u>	

Of the sum of £5612:14:2, the sum of £2309:14:4 was retained by the secretary for his own use, and the residue (£3302:10:10) was applied in payment of the deputy-secretary, clerks, messenger, and other expenses of the office.

AN ACCOUNT of the several Sums of Money received by the PURSE-BEARER to the Lord Chancellor, during Three Years, commencing May 1st, 1827; distinguishing the Amount received from Public Seals and from Private Seals.

Years.	Total. £	Public Seals. £	Private Seals. £
1828	3604	481	3123
1829	3766	320	3445
1830	4081	396	3685

In the third column are included the receipt and docquet fees, which are paid whether the instrument is sealed at public or private seal.

There were sealed, at private seal, from 1st May, 1827, to 30th April, 1828, 3704 writs, at 3s. 3d. amounting to £601:18; from 1st May, 1828, to 30th April, 1829, 4937 writs, at 3s. 3d. amounting to £802:5:3: and, from 1st May, 1829, to 30th April, 1830, 4861 writs, at 3s. 3d. amounting to £789:18:3. This sum of 3s. 3d. is thus appropriated:—the Lord Chancellor, 2s.; sixpenny-writ duty, 6d.; chaff-wax, 3d.; sealer, 3d.; porter, 3d.

MASTERS IN CHANCERY.

AN ACCOUNT of the Sums of Money received by Master STRATFORD and his Clerks, from his Office, in One Year, ending in 1830.—Parl. Paper, No. 361, Session 1830.

<i>The Master:</i>		£	£
For copies of papers and other proceedings, including particulars	2071		
Warrants	676		
Swearing affidavits, answers, and examinations	48		
Reports and certificates upon orders made upon petitions or motions	200		
Reports and certificates made upon hearing causes	184		
Sales and other matters	84		
			3265
<i>The Chief Clerk:</i>			
On copies of reports, &c.	118		
On swearing affidavits, &c.	6		
On reports and certificates made upon petitions or motions	60		
Ditto on hearing Causes	46		
Sales and other matters	258		
Gratuities	583		
			1074
<i>The Copying Clerk:</i>			
For copies	431		
For transcripts and ingrossments	17		
			448
Total		£ 4789	

The master's salary, received quarterly from the Exchequer, is £87:6 per annum; and for robe-money, from the Hanaper-office, £6:8:10 per annum.

The master's salary, received from the suitors' fund, in the Accountant-General's Office, half-yearly, is £600 per annum.

The clerks have no salaries; they are remunerated solely by fees, partly belonging officially to the chief clerk, and partly by a participation of the master's fees, regulated by usage or particular agreement between him and his clerks; and varying in different offices.

* Returns were made, to the House of Commons, of the emoluments of the other Masters in Chancery; but, as the sources whence they arise and their amount are similar to Master Stratford's, we omit them, to save room.

AN ACCOUNT of the Sums paid in the Year 1829, and the Total Sums paid from 1826, for COMPENSATIONS for LOSS of FEES, under Authority of 6 Geo. IV. c. 96, intituled, "An Act for preventing frivolous Writs of Error."

	1829.			Total, from 1826.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
The Hon. Thomas Kenyon, filacer, exigenter, and clerk of the outlawries in the Court of King's Bench	5,463	7	0	16,590	8	8
Henry Edgell, Esq. clerk of the errors in the Exchequer Chamber	2,521	16	11½	8,339	19	5
*Cursitors for London and Middlesex:						
Robert Talbot, Esq.	1,176	11	5½	3,629	18	5½
Hon. William Henry John Scott	1,176	11	5½	3,629	18	5½
William Villiers Surtees, Esq.	1,176	11	5½	3,629	18	5½
Richard Wilson, Esq.	1,176	11	5½	3,629	18	5½
Ushers of the Court of Exchequer:						
Richard Grey	15	1	6	50	16	6
John Morris						
William Broadhurst						
Lewis Williams						
William Stewart Rose, Esq. clerk of the pleas of the Court of Exchequer	65	4	0	100	4	0
	£12,771	15	3½	£39,601	2	6

Filacer, exigenter, and clerk of the outlawries in the Court of King's Bench, appointed by the Lord Chief Justice.

Clerk of the errors in the Exchequer Chamber, appointed by the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

Cursitors for London and Middlesex, appointed by the Lord Chancellor.

Ushers of the Court of Exchequer, appointed by the Chief Usher, who holds his office in fee, under grant from the Crown, *temp.* Henry II.

Clerk of the Pleas of the Court of Exchequer, appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.

Number of Persons committed for Debt to the several Prisons of the Metropolis in the Year 1827, and the Sums for which they were committed.—Parl. Paper, No. 76, Session 1828.

	For sums above £100.	For sums between £50&£100.	For sums between £20&£50.	For sums under £20.	Total.	In custody Jan. 1, 1828.
King's Bench Prison	474	354	550	213	1591	674
Fleet Prison	206	141	223	113	683	253
Whitecross-street Prison ..	206	273	816	600	1893	378
Marshalsea Prison	20	30	166	414	630	102
Horsemonger-lane Prison ..	57	58	134	923	1172	105
Total	963	856	1889	2263	5969	1512

* We should like to be informed what course the cursitors intend to pursue, in consequence of the alterations made by the act of last session, for the more effectual Administration of Justice in England and Wales. By that act, the cursitorial department of Wales is annexed to the four cursitors for London and Middlesex. But surely these gentlemen, who, for several years, have been receiving an annual compensation for the losses sustained by the *Writ of Error Act*, will make some return to the public from the additional gains accruing to them from the new arrangement.

PROGRESS

OF THE

PUBLIC DEBT AND TAXES.

THE annual income of a nation consists of the united produce of its agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. Taxes are a certain proportion of the annual income levied for the public service. In other words, they are a certain proportion of the income of the labourer, the farmer, the merchant, and manufacturer, abstracted for the use of the government. The portion of income the different classes can appropriate to this purpose, without creating national poverty and misery, is limited. If taxation be carried beyond this limit, the necessities of life of the labouring classes will be abridged, the profits of trade and agriculture will be so far reduced, that capital will diminish, or cease to be employed, or transferred to countries where it will be more productive. England, in the privations of the people—the protracted stagnation of industry, only interrupted by transitory gleams of prosperity—the embarrassments of the agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing classes—the emigration of capital—and the inability of the farmer, unaided by the artificial high prices produced by corn-laws, to cultivate the soil—exhibits all the evils of a country suffering from the pressure of overwhelming taxation.

Some, indeed, contend that taxation has no share in producing these calamities. The fallacy of this will easily appear. Taxation being a certain portion of the income of every individual, the evils it produces will be obvious, by considering the different effects produced by this portion of the annual income remaining in the hands of individuals, and being paid to government. In the former case, the income of every individual would be increased, the labourer and artisan would have a greater command over the necessities of life; the profits of the farmer, merchant, and manufacturer augmented; their capital increased, consequently commerce and the means of creating employment extended.

But this is not all; supposing public burthens reduced, there would be fewer placemen, pensioners, collectors of taxes, soldiers and sailors to be supported. These classes might be returned to the plough or the loom, and occupied in the pursuits of commerce and the cultivation of the earth. There would be no want of capital for these undertakings. The abolition of taxes would create capital. In short, the general effect of a reduction of taxes is this: the power of production and consumption, or, in other words, the quantity of employment and the means of subsistence are augmented.

It is a favourite dogma with some, especially those who live on the public, that taxes return to those from whom they are collected; which is about as good as the defence of a housebreaker, who, convicted of carrying off a merchant's property, should plead he did him no injury, for the money would be returned to him in purchasing the commodities he dealt in. But it may be asked of those who maintain this position, in what manner are the taxes returned? Certainly, taxes are paid in money; this money is again paid to the servants of government; these again pay it to the cultivator of the soil and manufacturer; and in this manner, it may be said, that taxes return to those from whom they were collected. But on this latter part of the operation it must be observed, that before either the cultivator or manufacturer can re-possess himself of his portion of the taxes, he must part with a certain quantity of his commodities in exchange; so that tax-paying revolves itself at last into the industrious giving a certain portion of their produce for the maintenance of government.

Here is the true source of the privations and embarrassments of the country. The portion of every man's produce levied for the support of government, of pensioners, placemen, sinecurists, and standing armies, has invaded the funds necessary to the comfortable subsistence of the labourer, and for carrying on the trade, commerce, and agriculture of the kingdom.

Having alluded to the general principle of taxation, let us consider those measures by which the present enormous load of debt and taxes has been incurred. The principles on which government has been conducted have not varied since the Revolution of 1688 to the present time. The wars waged have generally commenced for trivial and unattainable objects,—and these objects have generally not been obtained; under pretence of guarding against distant and improbable danger, the country has been involved in present and imminent ones; passion and pride, rather than any views of national advantage, have been the actuating principles of government; and as they engaged in war rashly, they persevered in it obstinately, and rejected more favourable terms of pacification than they were afterwards under the necessity of accepting. In short, our wars have been wars of ambition, of pride, folly, and despotism, originating in, and carried on by, the corrupt state of the representation. Let us endeavour to give some idea of the cost of these parliamentary wars from the Revolution, as evinced by the increase of taxation and the Borough Debt.

WILLIAM THE THIRD'S REIGN, FROM 1688 TO 1702.*

The public income at the Revolution amounted to £2,001,855. At the death of William it had increased to £3,895,205, being nearly doubled. This augmentation arose from various new duties; especially the excise on salt, the distillery, and the malt-tax. The other sources of revenue were the customs, land-tax, poll-taxes, a tax on births, marriages, and burials, hearth-money, the post-office, and other smaller duties. The total sums raised by taxes and by loans, during this reign, were as follow:—

Customs	£13,296,833	14	6
Excise	13,649,328	0	5½
Land-taxes	19,174,059	8	3½
Polls	2,557,649	7	7½
Burials, births, marriages, and bachelors, &c.	275,517	18	1
Various articles, including permanent loans and temporary loans unpaid	23,093,980	16	7½
	<hr/>		
	£72,047,369	5	6¾

Of the fourteen years of this reign, nearly ten were years of war. The military and naval expenses amounted to £44,847,382, being more than one-half the whole expenditure of government. After all the blood and treasure expended by William, his ambition and revenge remained unsatisfied; and the ostensible object of the war, the curbing the ambition of Louis XIV. unattained. Speaking of the conclusion of this contest at the treaty of Ryswick, Smollett observes,—“Such was the issue of a long and bloody war, which had drained England of her wealth and people, almost entirely ruined her commerce, debauched her morals, by encouraging venality and corruption, and entailed upon her the curse of foreign connexions, as well as a national debt, which was gradually increased to an intolerable burthen.”—*Continuation of Hume*, vol. i. p. 330.

The funding system, and the mode of raising money by lotteries and exchequer-bills, commenced in this reign.

QUEEN ANN'S REIGN, FROM 1701 TO 1714.

The revenue, at the commencement of this reign, amounted to £3,195,205. At the period of the union with Scotland, in 1709, the revenue of England amounted to £5,691,803. The sums received into the Exchequer, during twelve years and three-quarters, were—

* The amount of revenue, and the estimate of the naval and military expenses, from the Revolution to the end of the reign of George II. are taken from Dr. Colquhoun's Treatise on the Resources of the British Empire.

Customs	£15,113,811
Excise.....	20,850,909
Land-tax	12,285,909
Miscellaneous, including Post Office, Stamps, and smaller loans of the Revenue	5,261,346
Amount of Loans.....	59,853,154
	<hr/>
Total.....	£122,373,531
	<hr/>

Of the thirteen years of this reign, twelve were years of war. The military and naval expenses amounted to £58,560,581. The object of Queen Ann's wars, like those of her predecessor, purely continental. They were terminated by the disgraceful treaty of Utrecht, in 1712, when our allies were ignominiously abandoned. The peace establishment of this period is estimated at £1,965,605.

GEORGE THE FIRST'S REIGN, FROM 1714 TO 1727.

On the death of Queen Ann, the Borough Debt amounted to £52,145,363; but though her successor enjoyed a period of uninterrupted tranquillity, no effort appears to have been made to reduce it. On the 31st of December, 1727, the principal amounted to £52,092,235; the interest to £2,219,551. The aggregate sum which passed into the Exchequer of George I., during a reign of twelve years, three months, and ten days, amounted to £79,832,160. The revenue at the time of his death amounted to £4,162,643.

GEORGE THE SECOND'S REIGN, FROM 1727 TO 1760.

The prosperous state of the country, for the first twelve years of profound peace at the commencement of this reign, might have admitted of a considerable reduction of the debt, had not Sir Robert Walpole, a *genuine Whig*, been minister. Instead of expending the surplus revenue in the liquidation of the debt, it was employed in parliamentary corruption. During ten years, from 1707 to 1717, *secret service money* amounted only to £337,960. From 1731 to 1741 it cost the nation £1,453,400. This augmentation is ascribed to the increased pay Sir Robert gave to the *honourable* members for their votes and speeches in support of his administration. The whole of the debt paid off in this long peace, amounted only to £5,137,612, the interest of which was £253,516.

The wars of George II. commenced in 1739, and were concluded at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748. The total expense of these contests is estimated, by Dr. Colquhoun, at £46,418,680. The nation

Mr. COKE, of Norfolk, when he characterized this monarch's reign as the most sanguinary and disastrous in the English annals, was not far from the truth. In the course of it were three principal wars: the American war, the revolutionary war, and the war of 1815. All these wars were waged against human liberty and happiness; and the two last commenced on a principle which we would fain hope is now disclaimed by every government in Europe—namely, the right of one nation to interfere with another in its domestic affairs. We will state the cost of each, as shown in the sums raised by taxes and by loans.

AMERICAN WAR.

Years.	Revenue.	Loans.
1775	£10,138,061	
1776	10,265,405	£2,000,000
1777	10,604,013	5,500,000
1778	10,732,405	6,000,000
1779	11,192,141	7,000,000
1780	12,255,214	12,000,000
1781	12,454,936	12,000,000
1782	12,593,297	13,500,000
1783	11,962,718	12,000,000
1784	12,905,519	12,879,341
1785	14,871,520	10,990,651
	£142,975,229	£93,869,992

The American war terminated in 1783 ; but as the loans of the two following years were raised to wind up the expenses of that struggle, it is proper they should be included. The total expense of the American war will stand thus :—

Taxes.....	£142,975,229
Loans	93,869,992
Advances by the Bank of England	110,000
Advances by the East-India Company	3,200,000
Increase in the unfunded Debt	5,170,273
	<hr/>
	£242,265,494
Deduct expense of a peace-establishment for eleven years, as it stood in 1794	£113,142,403
	<hr/>
Net cost of the American war	<u>£129,123,091</u>

This, then, is the sum expended by the Boroughmongers in an attempt to enslave the colonies. George III. boasted that he was the last man in his dominions to subscribe to the peace with America : he left his people burthened with a debt of *one hundred and thirty millions*, as the price of his obstinacy, and an abortive attempt to impose, on a brave people, the tyrannical principle of *taxation without representation*.

The second war was still more atrocious than the first ; it was a war not merely against liberty, but the principles of liberty ; it was a barbarous and gigantic effort of the privileged orders to prevent the amelioration of society, and to render mankind the eternal victims of ecclesiastic and aristocratic tyranny. As the war of 1793 was more

diabolical in its objects than the contest with America, so we should say, had its calamities only extended to its authors, has it been more justly ruinous in its consequences. Let us endeavour to estimate the cost of this liberticide and Vandal contest. We shall state the sums raised by taxes, and the debt contracted each year from its commencement, and then deduct the probable expenditure of the country, had no such war existed.

The account of sums raised by taxes is taken from Dr. Hamilton's *Inquiry into the National Debt*, p. 203, third edition. The amount of debt contracted, including navy and exchequer bills funded, is also taken from the same writer, p. 320. The short peace of Amiens, and the interval betwixt the exile and return of Bonaparte from Elba, may be considered rather a suspension of hostilities than a period of peace; therefore, we have considered it as one uninterrupted war from 1793 to 1815, having the same objects—the maintenance of the usurpations of the Clergy and Aristocracy.

Years.	Taxes. £	Loans. £
1793	17,656,418	25,926,526
1794	17,170,400	—
1795	17,308,411	51,705,698
1796	17,858,454	56,945,566
1797	18,737,760	25,350,000
1798	20,654,650	35,624,250
1799	30,202,915	21,875,000
1800	35,229,968	29,045,000
1801	33,896,464	44,816,250
1802	35,415,296	41,489,438
1803	37,240,213	16,000,000
1804	37,677,063	18,200,000
1805	45,359,442	39,543,124
1806	49,659,281	29,880,000
1807	53,304,254	18,373,200
1808	58,390,255	13,693,254
1809	61,538,207	21,278,122
1810	63,405,294	19,811,108
1811	66,681,366	29,244,711
1812	64,763,870	40,743,031
1813	63,169,845	54,780,324
1814	66,925,835	63,645,930
1815	69,684,192	70,888,402
	<u>£952,929,653</u>	<u>£764,859,036</u>

After making some deductions on account of the operations of the *loyalty loan*, and the transfer of annuities, the total debt, contracted from 1793 to 1815, amounts to £762,537,445. If to this sum be

added the increase in the unfunded debt during that period, and the additional sums raised by taxes, in consequence of hostilities, we shall have the total expenditure, owing to the French war, as follows:—

Debt contracted from 1793 to 1815	£762,537,445
Increase in the unfunded debt, ditto	50,194,060*
War-taxes	614,488,459†
Total expense of the French war ..	<u>£1,427,219,964</u>

Two objections may be made to the fairness of this statement. First, the amount of debt redeemed during the war, by the operation of the *Sinking Fund*, ought to be deducted from the amount of debt contracted. The second objection arises from the mode of negotiating loans. In each loan, the capital funded exceeds the sum actually advanced to government. In some loans, government acknowledges itself debtor £100, when only from £54 to £60 is actually received. Hence it follows that, from the debt contracted since 1793, ought to be deducted the difference betwixt that debt and the sums which passed into the Exchequer.

After admitting deductions from the charges of the war on this account, and the operation of the sinking fund, we must be allowed to make a trifling addition. The loans raised for Ireland, guaranteed by Britain, amounted to £103,032,750. The sums actually received on account of these loans to £64,750,000. The revenue of Ireland, in 1791, amounted only to £1,190,684. Owing to the increase of the Irish revenue during the war, the war-taxes of Ireland cannot be estimated at less than £80,000,000. After these deductions and additions the account will stand thus:—

Sums raised on account of loans	£506,081,267
Sums raised on account of Irish loans	64,750,000
War-taxes in England	614,488,459
Ditto in Ireland	80,000,000
Increase in the unfunded debt	50,194,060
	<u>1,255,513,786</u>
Deduct sums paid to the Commissioners for the reduction of the debt	173,309,383
Total	<u>£1,082,204,403</u>

* The unfunded debt in 1793..... £14,902,635

Ditto 1815..... 65,096,695 increase as above. Dr.

Hamilton's Inquiry, p. 338.

† This sum is obtained by deducting, from the total amount of taxes during the war, the taxes which would have been raised had the expenditure of 1793 continued.

The statement is now divested of every extraneous item, and, reducing it to its lowest amount, *one thousand and eighty-two millions two hundred and four thousand four hundred and three pounds* remains as the sum actually received and expended on account of the war with France, from 1793 to 1815. On an average of the twenty-two years, from 1793 to 1815, it is a war expenditure of nearly fifty millions; and this is the sum which the tax-ridden, law-ridden, priest-ridden, deluded people of England yearly contributed out of the produce of their industry, agriculture, and commerce, to prevent an independent state altering the form and meliorating the abuses of its government.

Can we wonder, after the tremendous sacrifice in pursuit of this unrighteous object, at the terrible calamities with which the country is afflicted? Can we wonder at our exhausted, impoverished, and embarrassed condition? More than *one hundred millions* expended in an abortive attempt to enslave the American colonies; more than *one thousand millions* expended to re-establish feudal and ecclesiastical tyranny in France. This forms the financial history of the public debt and taxes—of the ELEVEN HUNDRED MILLIONS expended in the wars of despotism. And what has been the result of this lavish waste of national resources? The answer is—the three immortal days of Paris—the triumph of Belgium—the regeneration of Europe—and the complete—the full—the glorious establishment of those very principles the English Aristocracy vainly sought to exterminate.

When we look back to the history of the last century—the wars of madness, ambition, and tyranny which have been waged, when we reflect on the millions expended in these wars—the fruits of unexampled industry, skill, and enterprise; when we think of our present situation—the piercing privations of the bulk of the community—the discontent and disunion among all classes—the abuses pervading every department of our social and general administration—Ireland on the point of rebellion or separation; when we think, we repeat, on these things, and contrast them with the situation of glory and happiness England might have attained, under a wise and honest government, administering her exhaustless resources in the promotion of the arts of peace, instead of slaughter, bondage, and devastation; we feel not less indignant at the wickedness of our rulers than the apathy which has so long tolerated their folly and their crimes.

EXPOSITION

OF THE

FUNDING SYSTEM.

ALTHOUGH the feudal system was a barbarous social institution, it possessed the advantage of entailing on the fomenters of war its unavoidable cost and calamities. The old barons used to arm themselves and vassals at their own expense, and support them during the contest. There was then no standing army nor permanent revenue,—those who tilled the land fought the battles of the country. Under such a system, wars could neither be very long in their duration, nor very remote in their objects. Foreign expeditions suited as little to the national resources as the avocations of the people. The only time that could be spared to settle public quarrels was between seed-time and harvest, and the only treasure they could be provided with before-hand was the surplus produce of the preceding year. Hence, wars were generally either carried on languidly, or were of short duration. Their operations were frequently interrupted by truces, and sometimes discontinued through mere feebleness. A warlike leader was often stopped short in his victorious career, either from the want of resources, or the necessity of allowing his followers to return home to provide subsistence for the following season.

The state of the sovereign was as little favourable to protracted contests as the condition of his lieges. His revenue was derived partly from lands reserved as a royal demesne, and partly from feudal casualties, and afforded a slender provision for maintaining the royal dignity, and defraying the ordinary expenses of government, but was altogether inadequate to the support of numerous and permanent armies. Supplies from the people were obtained to a certain extent; but the people neither possessed the means, nor, happily, had acquired the habit of granting liberal supplies. Princes, under any emergency, real or supposed, or actuated by any scheme of ambition, had recourse either to borrowing or *pawning*. The loans which they raised were partly compulsory, and, as the repayment was ill secured, the rate of interest was

high. Sometimes the jewels of the crown were pledged, and sometimes the crown-lands were mortgaged. In this manner, the revenues of most of the powers of Europe were anticipated and encumbered.

A new state of society introduced a new mode of supporting war. Instead of borrowing on their *own credit*, sovereigns learnt to borrow on the credit of *posterity*. The issue of war no longer depended on a single battle or successful irruption, but on the length of the public purse. It was not money, however, that formed the sinews of war, but *credit*. Credit superseded money, and modern policy found out the expedient of supporting wars for temporary objects, and entailing the burthen of them on future generations. This system possessed too many facilities to be abandoned, or not to be carried to the utmost extent of which it was capable. And, accordingly, we find wherever the system of borrowing and funding has been introduced, it has gone on with an accelerated velocity till the payment of the principal became quite chimerical, and governments were obliged to compound with their creditors for the interest.

The Debt of this country, which was inconsiderable at the Revolution, has increased, in less than a century and a half, to its present magnitude. The increase during every reign, except the pacific reigns of George I. and George IV. has been greater than the preceding. The increase, during every war, has been greater than during the preceding. The increase, during the latter period of every war, has been greater than during the earlier period. The increase, by every hostile interference or warlike demonstration, has been greater than administration held forth when the measure was undertaken. The part of the Debt paid off, during peace, has borne a small proportion to that contracted by the preceding war.

These are the general characteristics which have marked the progress of the funding system: it has been the national spendthrift vice that has operated on the public welfare, like the addiction to some baneful passion in an individual; indulgence augmented appetite, till, at length, the malady has reached a state of virulence which precludes all hope of cure or alleviation. As to the honest liquidation of the debt, that is an idea we believe not a single person to entertain; all that the most reasonable look forward to is postponement, until such a crisis in public affairs occurs, as will demonstrate to all parties the expediency of coming to terms—*of a compromise*, for mutual safety and advantage. We are now in the *sixteenth year of peace*, and, comparatively, no portion of the debt has been redeemed by actual payment; the reduction in the annual charge has been chiefly effected by the conversion of stocks of a high into those of a lower denomination,—a mode of procedure accompanied with serious suffering to particular classes of annuitants, and accomplished by ministerial combinations in the money-market, for artificially forcing up the prices of stocks, hardly justifiable. Before, however, advertent particularly to the redemption of the debt, let us give a few explanations of the funds and government paper.

The term Fund signifies, generally, any sum of money or annual

revenue appropriated to a particular purpose. The *Sinking Fund*—of which we shall, by and by, give a curious history—means a sum of money set apart for the purpose of discharging the public debt. Generally speaking, we mean, by the Funds, those large sums which have been lent to government, and constitute the Debt, and for which the lenders, or their assigns, receive interest from the public revenue. The term *Stock* is used nearly in the same sense; but is more strictly applicable to the different branches of the Debt, bearing different or the same rate of interest; as the 3 per Cents Reduced, or the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per Cents, and which, together, constitute the aggregate public debt. It is, also, applied to the sums which form the capital of the Bank, the East-India Company, the South-Sea Company, and other public companies, the proprietors of which are entitled to a share of their respective profits.

Although the public creditor cannot demand payment of the capital debt, the mode of transferring it, even in small sums, is so conveniently arranged, and the dividends so regularly paid, that it is considered an eligible property. The value of the Funds is liable to considerable fluctuation. It depends chiefly on the proportion between the interest they bear and the profit which may be obtained by applying capital to other purposes. It is influenced by the plenty or scarcity of money; and it is impaired by any event which threatens the safety or weakens the credit of government. It is always much higher in time of peace than in time of war; and is affected by every event, and even by every report, in time of war, favourable or unfavourable. False reports are frequently raised by knavish people for that purpose.

In the early part of the Funding System, a separate account was kept of each loan, and of the tax imposed for payment of the interest. This method was afterwards found inconvenient, as the produce of some of the taxes fell short of the expected sum, while that of others exceeded it, and the multiplicity of funds produced confusion. To obviate this inconvenience, the different funds were united, and to each various branches of revenue were appropriated, charged with the payment of the annuities.

Besides the funded debt, is a large sum due by government under the name of the *unfunded debt*. It arises from any national expense, for which no provision has been made, or the provision has proved insufficient, or not forthcoming at the time wanted. The forms of the unfunded debt are various; but the following are the principal branches.

Exchequer-bills.—These are issued from the Exchequer, in consequence of acts of parliament, several of which are passed every session. The first were issued in 1696, and being intended as a temporary substitute for money during the recoinage at that period; some of them were so low as £10 and £5. There are none issued now under £100; and many of them are for £500, £1000, and still larger sums. They bear interest, at a certain rate per day, for £100; and, being distributed among those who are willing to advance their value, they form a kind of circulating medium. After a certain time, they are received in payment of taxes, or other monies due to government; and the interest

due on them, at the time, is allowed in the payment. The Bank often engages to receive them to a certain extent, and thereby promotes their circulation; and the daily transaction between the Bank and the Exchequer are chiefly carried on by bills of £1000 deposited in the Exchequer by the Bank, to the amount of the sums received by them on account of government. New Exchequer-bills are frequently issued in discharge of former ones; and they are often converted into funded debt, by granting capital, in some of the stocks, on certain terms, to such holders as are willing to accept them.

Navy-bills.—These are issued from the Navy-Office to answer any purpose in that branch of public expenditure; and they bear interest after a certain date, if not discharged.

Ordinance-bills, or Debentures, are issued, in like manner, from the Ordinance-Office, for supplying deficiencies in that branch of expenditure. *Victualling* and *Transport Bills* are issued from the respective offices in the same manner. There is also always a large amount of floating debt at the Navy, Victualling, Transport, and Ordinance Offices, for which no bills have been issued.

Besides the three principal branches of the unfunded debt, there is always a number of demands on the public for bills accepted by the Treasury; army charges, and micellaneous services of various kinds. These are daily fluctuating, and their amount, at any particular time, cannot be easily ascertained.

Our next object will be to exhibit a brief statement of the progress of the Debt, and its successive augmentations and diminutions during different reigns and periods of war and peace, and the total amount at the present time.

Summary of the Progress of the Debt from the Commencement of the Funding System, at the Revolution, to the 5th January, 1830.

	Principal.	Interest.
National Debt at the Revolution of 1688..	£ 664,263	£ 39,855
Increase during the reign of William III.	15,730,439	1,271,087
Debt at the accession of Queen Ann	16,394,702	1,310,942
Increase during the reign of Queen Ann	37,750,661	2,040,416
Debt at the accession of George I.....	54,145,363	3,351,338
Decrease during the reign of George I. ..	2,053,128	1,133,807
Debt at the accession of George II.....	52,092,235	2,217,551
Decrease during the peace	5,137,612	253,526
Debt at the commencement of the war of 1739	46,954,623	1,964,025
Increase during the war	31,338,689	1,096,979

PROGRESS AND PRESENT STATE OF THE DEBT. 307

Debt at the end of the war, 1748	£78,293,312	£3,061,004
Decrease during the peace	3,721,472	664,287
Debt at the commencement of the war, 1755	74,571,840	2,396,717
Increase during the war	72,111,004	2,444,104
Debt at the conclusion of the war, 1782..	146,682,844	4,840,821
Decrease during the peace	10,739,793	364,000
Debt at the commencement of the American war, 1776.....	135,943,051	4,476,821
Increase during the war	102,541,819	3,843,084
Debt at the conclusion of the American war, 1783	238,484,870	8,319,905
Decrease during the peace	4,751,261	143,569
Debt at the establishment of the Sinking Fund, 1786.....	249,175,323	10,774,398
Increase from 1786 to 1793	5,131,112	94,577
Debt at commencement of the war of 1793	254,306,435	10,868,975
Increase to the peace of 1801	293,591,441	12,438,767
Debt at the peace of Amiens, 1801	547,897,876	23,307,742
Increase during the peace	81,569,653	3,735,883
Debt at the renewal of the war, in 1803..	629,467,529	27,043,625
Increase during the war	491,940,407	16,940,954
Debt at the peace of 1815	1,121,407,936	43,984,579
Increase during the peace, to 1819	108,987,631	5,202,771
Debt, January 5, 1819	1,230,395,567	49,187,350
Deduct Debt redeemed by Sinking Fund	389,637,049	15,815,001
Net unredeemed Funded Debt of the United Kingdom, January 5, 1819....	840,758,518	33,372,349*
Net unredeemed Funded Debt of the United Kingdom, January 5, 1830....	771,251,932	28,285,900†

The unfunded debt, consisting principally of Exchequer-bills, amounted, January 5th, 1830, to £29,476,443, the interest of which, added to the interest of the funded debt, makes the aggregate annual charge upwards of twenty-nine millions per annum.

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 35, Session 1819.

† Annual Finance Accounts, p. 155, Session 1830.

The diminution in the annual charge of the debt, during the fifteen years of peace, may be ascribed, in a considerable proportion, to the reduction of the rate of interest on the 5 and 4 per cent. stocks, and on Exchequer-bills, and to the falling in of terminable annuities. A further diminution was effected in the session of 1830, by the conversion of the New Fours into a three-and-a-half per cent. stock. Altogether, the savings effected by these conversions amount to three millions and a half per annum; and the total reduction in the annuity, payable to the public creditor, amounts to four millions and a half.* It appears, then, the diminution in the annual charge of the debt has not been the result of ministerial economy and retrenchment, but of the internal state of the country—the *redundancy of unemployed capital*, which, by lowering the rate of interest, and thereby enhancing the price of the funds, enabled government to offer to the holders of stock, of a high denomination, the option of being either paid off at par, or the acceptance of a lower rate of interest.

A desirable fact to ascertain is, the permanent charge entailed on the community by the war of 1793. From the extensive inquiries of the Finance Committee of 1828, this subject may be correctly illustrated. The annual augmentation of the permanent charge of the debt, between 1792 and 1816, was £22,744,360.† To this must be added, the charge for the half-pay and pensions of the army and navy and civil retired allowances, called the dead weight, amounting to £5,363,640 per annum. We must, also, allow for the increase in salaries, in civil and colonial establishments, which were a consequence of hostilities. The results will be best expressed in a tabular form.

Permanent Burthen entailed on the Country by the Revolutionary War, from 1793 to 1815.

Interest of the debt contracted during the war	£22,744,360
The annual charge for half-pay, pensions, and superannuation allowances, amounting, in 1830, to £5,363,640; but consisting almost all of life annuities, may be computed equal to a permanent burthen of.....	2,250,000
Exclusive of this last item, the expenditure of the army and navy is greatly augmented since 1792, partly from the extension of our foreign possessions, and partly from the augmented military force kept up in Ireland and Great Britain.—On account of the war, say	2,500,000
Increase of Civil List, salaries, and pensions.....	2,000,000
Other charges not enumerated	1,000,000
Total.....	£30,494,360

Such is the amount of the burthen entailed on the country by the last war of the Aristocracy. Yet the usurpers have the meanness to

* Viscount Goderich, House of Lords, May 5, 1830.

† Fourth Report of Select Committee on Public Income and Expenditure, p. 20.

refuse £250,000 a year for the purposes of emigration. They have even the baseness to complain of the amount of poor-rates; they grumble to pay a few millions per annum for the relief of the aged, the infirm, and destitute, while they have wantonly burthened the community with a perpetual incumbrance of upwards of THIRTY MILLIONS per annum in war and devastation. Although they have thus mortgaged for ever national resources, happiness, and enjoyments, they aggravate the calamities they have created, by clinging with the grasp of death to enormous salaries, sinecures, and unmerited pensions. Can any one who has a head to think, or heart to feel, suppress indignation in contemplating this unexampled record of infatuation, injustice, and oppression?

PLANS FOR THE REDEMPTION OF THE DEBT.

Having given a general illustration of the nature of the Funds, and of the progress and present amount of the Debt, our next object will be shortly to notice the empyrical projects set on foot and countenanced by the Aristocracy, for its redemption.

Although the Sinking Fund, established under the auspices of Mr. Pitt, was founded on as gross a fallacy as ever deluded a nation, yet, if we examine the subject attentively, we shall find that ministers had similar reasons for adhering to the delusion that they had in adhering to any other branch of expenditure. First, the keeping up of a Sinking Fund was a pretext for keeping up taxation. Secondly, the management of the fund was a pretext for keeping up a certain amount of patronage, fees, and emoluments. Lastly, the Sinking Fund left a surplus sum at the disposal of ministers, ready to be applied to any casual object they might think expedient. They might employ it to subsidize foreign despots, to enter on new wars, or to supply deficiencies in the civil list, or any other department of expenditure. That the money was voted for other purposes formed no security that it would not be so applied; experience having shewn that ministers never hesitated to encroach on the Sinking Fund when it suited their necessities.

These, we apprehend, formed some of the reasons for maintaining the Sinking Fund, long after its fallacy had been demonstrated. Some reluctance, too, was no doubt felt to abandon a scheme of finance which had been panegyriized by many distinguished individuals; and, in fact, the history of the Sinking Fund is the most striking proof of the gullibility of our "great men," that can any where be found; and it is chiefly for the purpose of illustrating the superlative abilities of hereditary legislators, that we are induced to devote any space to the exposition of the subject.

Mr. Pitt's plan of a Sinking Fund was, to set apart a portion of the surplus revenue, to accumulate by *compound interest*, and, after the expiration of a certain period, to apply the aggregate amount of interest and principal to the liquidation of the debt. To show the fallacy of this

scheme, it will be necessary to premise a few explanations on the nature of interest.

Interest is of two kinds, either simple or compound; simple interest is that which is allowed for the use of the principal only; compound interest, called also interest on interest, is that which is allowed for the use of both principal and interest taken together. If money be lent at simple interest, suppose five per cent. per annum, it will double itself in twenty years; that is, if the interest be forborn that time, it will equal the principal. If money be laid out at compound interest, on the same terms, it will double itself in little more than fourteen years; so that the different rate at which money increases by simple and compound interest is very considerable. To illustrate this by an example, we will suppose £100 lent at five per cent. compound interest, for one hundred years. At the expiration of the first fourteen years (omitting the fraction of a year) it would amount to £200; at the expiration of the second fourteen years to £400; at the expiration of the third fourteen years to £800; and so on, doubling itself at the expiration of every fourteen years, till, at the expiration of the one hundred years, it would have increased to the sum of £14,112; while, had the same money been put out at simple interest, it would have amounted only to £600; £500 being the interest of £100 for one hundred years, at five per cent. per annum.

Now, it is on this power of money to accumulate, at compound interest, that the Sinking Fund was established. Dr. Price, an expert arithmetician, calculated that a penny, or a farthing, we forget which, laid out at compound interest, at the birth of Christ, would, at the time he wrote, have accumulated to several *globes of gold, each globe as large as the earth*. This was really prodigious; and the Doctor was so pleased with the result, that he thence conceived the idea of redeeming the national debt. He thought, that if a sum of money, no matter how small, could only be once laid out at compound interest, it would, in a century or so, amount to a sum equal to the debt itself, and, by means of which, the debt might be discharged. All the Doctor wanted was TIME; money he did not want, except a farthing or a penny to begin with. Nothing could be more alluring; to pay off the debt by so small a sum as one penny, seemed, next to a sponge, the cheapest way imaginable.

Doctor Price communicated his scheme to Mr. Pitt, who appears to have been as much captivated as the Doctor with the discovery. This was in 1786; a time favourable for the experiment, the country being at peace with all the world, commerce and agriculture just recovering from the depression of the American contest, and, what was more, there was a surplus revenue of a million to begin with. This million, it was resolved, should be set apart to "fructify" by the miraculous powers of compound interest, agreeably to Dr. Price's calculations. Commissioners were appointed to take charge of the sacred deposit, which, on no pretext, was to be violated: and thus did the Sinking Fund, which, like little David, was to bring down the Goliath of the debt, commence.

All at once, however, the people were seized with a strange panic, from entertaining the most gloomy apprehensions that the debt would never be paid, they began to fear it would be paid *too soon*; the globes of gold had so bewildered the public mind, that it was apprehended, from the sudden payment of the debt, the country would be overwhelmed with money and unemployed capital. To avert so dire a calamity, Mr. Pitt announced his intention to pay off £4,000,000, annually, and no more. Here the subject rested for some years, and we must beg leave to rest also. Having stated fairly the principle of the Sinking Fund, we must now expose its fallacy as applicable to the reduction of the debt. It is due, however, to Dr. Price to observe that there was nothing wrong in his principle, that the effect of compound interest was correctly as he had calculated, and that he was only wrong, like many other well-meaning theorists, in his application of them.

The first objection to the scheme of Dr. Price was the length of time that must elapse before it attained its object. Any plan for the reduction of the debt, founded on an adherence to a particular system of finance, the continuance of a certain amount of taxation, or the duration of peace, was hardly likely to be realized in practice. These were all liable to change; yet a permanency in them was necessary to complete the original plan of the Sinking Fund. The sum set apart was on no pretext to be violated; war might arise demanding additional sacrifices, the ability of the country to support taxation might decrease, or there might arise new chancellors of the exchequer with new schemes of finance, yet none of these were to interfere with the fund. That a plan depending on such contingencies should be realized appears highly improbable.

Waving, however, the objection as to *time*, we will suppose the plan in actual operation; we will suppose a million set apart to accumulate by compound interest, till it equal in amount the debt it is intended to liquidate. Now, it is obvious, if the debt be very large, the Sinking Fund must be very large also; but, supposing the debt amounts to 800 millions, one cannot conceive how any Sinking Fund, long before it equals in amount the debt it is intended to discharge, can be employed, or in whose hands it can be invested. Suppose the fund amounts only to 200 millions, how can any government employ such a sum? To whom are they to lend it? If they lend it to individuals they will want security, not only for the interest but the principal. But the only adequate security would be land; commercial security would hardly be satisfactory; and, it is obvious, if landed security alone be accepted, the advance of 200 millions would make government the mortgagees of nearly all the land in the kingdom. Such a state of things is chimerical, and, consequently, any Sinking Fund founded upon it must be chimerical also.

Instead of reducing the debt in this way, it is easy to conceive another far more economical and equally efficacious. Suppose the money forming the fund had not been raised in taxes, but left in the hands of the people to be employed in trade and manufactures; then suppose, at the expiration of a certain time, a sum is levied in taxes

equal in amount to what the Fund would have attained ; it is obvious, on this supposition, the debt would be equally reduced ; but, in this case, there would be no Sinking Fund,—no commissioners,—no drawing money in shape of taxes, and returning it again in shape of loan ;—in a word, there would be no delusion.

Though the principle here illustrated is that on which the Sinking Fund was founded, it is not that according to which it has been conducted. The money forming the fund has never, in fact, been lent to individuals, but employed in the purchase of stock at the market-price. The interest of stock so purchased has been added to the fund, and the total employed in the purchase of more stock ; so that, by continually adding the interest of the debt redeemed to the principal of the fund, the effect has been the same as money accumulating at compound interest. If we compare this mode of employing a Sinking Fund with the former, we shall find that, if the first was chimerical, the second was useless, serving no object further than entailing an unnecessary expense on the public for management.

Suppose at the end of the year there is a surplus revenue of one million in the Exchequer ; then, agreeably to the system pursued by our statesmen for many years, this million is paid to commissioners, who employ it in the purchase of stock, the stock so purchased and interest forming together the Sinking Fund. But, instead of the million being vested in commissioners, suppose it is employed by the Chancellor of the Exchêquer in the purchase of stock, where, may be asked, would be the difference ? In both cases the same amount of debt is redeemed, and the interest of the redeemed debt, being laid out in the purchase of more stock, accumulates in a compound ratio.

It is in the latter way the Americans manage the reduction of their debt. When there is a surplus in the Treasury, after defraying the charges of government, it is applied directly to pay off such portions of the debt as have been advertised to be paid off, and on which the interest afterwards ceases to be paid. Indeed, the principle is so plain that it is astonishing how it can ever have been misapprehended. It is obvious to the meanest capacity that, if a sum of money be owing, on which interest is payable, the gain is equal, whether we pay a part of our debt, or lend, to a third person, a sum of equal amount. Government, however, acted as if there were some substantive difference in the two cases, and they were supported for years in the egregious blunder by the “ collective wisdom of the nation.”

We have not yet conducted the reader to the chief absurdity in the Sinking Fund. We have been all along supposing an *actual surplus revenue*, and considering the most advantageous mode of employing this surplus ; but the fact is, there never was any such surplus, except during the first few years after the establishment of the fund. Every year government incurred debt, and this debt it attempted to pay by *borrowed money* ; that is, it borrowed money of A to pay B, and in this consists the GRAND BUBBLE of the Sinking Fund, which we will now endeavour to expose.

The late Professor Hamilton, the first writer who exposed the delusion of the Sinking Fund, so as to attract general attention, lays down the following principle of finance:—"The *excess of revenue above expenditure* is the only real Sinking Fund by which the public debt can be discharged. The increase of the revenue or the diminution of expense is the only means by which this Sinking Fund can be enlarged, and its operations rendered more effectual; and all schemes for discharging the National Debt by sinking funds, operating by compound interest, or in any other manner, unless so far as they are founded on this principle, are illusory."—*Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of the National Debt*, p. 44.

This proposition is wholly incontrovertible, and has been, in part, already established. The same principles regulate the discharge of the debt of an individual and of a nation. Suppose an individual has contracted a certain extent of debt, and, afterwards, attains to circumstances which enable him to discharge it. If no unfair measures are practised against him by his creditors, and, if he pay the interest regularly, the sum which he must pay altogether, before he be clear of debt is the amount of money he borrowed, and the simple interest of the same from the time of its being borrowed to the time of re-payment. Suppose he borrows £10,000, and that for ten years he pays the interest, but no part of the principal. If the rate of interest be 5 per cent. he pays £500 annually for interest, or £5000 altogether; and if, by a sudden acquisition of wealth, he is able to discharge the debt at the end of ten years, he pays exactly £15,000 altogether. But suppose, by an amelioration in his circumstances, he is enabled to pay £1000 annually for principal and interest. The first year he pays £500 for interest, and £500 towards the discharge of the principal: the remaining debt is £9500, and the interest of this being £475, if he can pay £1000 next year he discharges £525 of the principal, leaving a debt of £8975. If he continue to act in this manner, applying each year £1000 to the payment of principal and interest, the whole debt will be discharged in about fourteen years and a quarter.

Instead of conducting the business in this way, he may pay only the £500 of interest to his creditors, and lend out the other £500 at interest, and lend again £500 more at the end of the next year, and so on, accumulating the sums lent, by compound interest, till they amount to £10,000, and then discharge his whole debt at once. It will require exactly the same time, of fourteen years and a quarter, to accomplish this. If he transact the business himself, the second way will be attended with more trouble, but the result will be the same. If he employ an agent to transact the loans, he will be a loser by following the last-mentioned method to the extent of the fees paid for agency.

Substitute millions or ten millions for thousands, and the above reasoning is equally applicable to the debt of a nation. If the debt be ever discharged, it can only be done by a *surplus revenue*; and, if the business be transacted, as private affairs are, the time required for the discharge of a public debt will be the same as the time required for the

discharge of a private one, when the proportion of surplus revenue is the same; and this holds whether the surplus be paid annually, in discharge of part of the debt, or accumulated in a Sinking Fund in the hands of commissioners appointed for that purpose: the only difference is that, in the latter method, an additional expense is incurred equal in amount to the fees and salaries of the commissioners, which would have been saved had the surplus been applied directly to pay a part of the Debt.

Hitherto we have supposed a surplus revenue; but suppose the expenditure of an individual exceeds his income £500 annually, and the deficiency is to be made up by borrowing. The first year he incurs a debt of £500; the second year, £500 more, which, with the interest of the first £500, makes his debt £1025; and the third year, £1551:5; and so on, till, at the end of fourteen years and a quarter, the total amount of debt and interest is £10,000.

Suppose, instead of borrowing £500, the individual is persuaded, by some calculator, to borrow a larger sum, with a view of establishing a Sinking Fund. Suppose he borrow, annually, £600 of A, £500 to satisfy his necessities, and £100 to lend to B for a Sinking Fund, to accumulate by compound interest. If he continue this plan for fourteen years, he will, at the end of that time, owe A £12,000, and B owe him £2000. But where would be his advantage? If he has a Sinking Fund of £2000, his debt is £12,000, being £2000 more, on account of the additional £100 borrowed to establish the Sinking Fund. On this plan, it is obvious the borrower would not, in the least, retard the embarrassment of his affairs, for, however much his Sinking Fund might increase, his debt would augment in as great a proportion: whatever he had owing from B, he would owe in addition to A.

Suppose the borrower paid for the management of his fund, he would incur a positive loss equal to the amount of B's charge for management.

On this extremely absurd principle the Debt, for nearly half a century, was conducted. Every year a sum was borrowed, not only to meet the deficiency of the revenue, but to support the delusion of a Sinking Fund. If the exigencies of government demanded a loan of twenty millions, a loan of twenty-one millions was obtained, so that one million might be set apart for the Fund. From what has been said, it is clear such a system was either futile or pernicious. If the Fund cost nothing for management it was merely nugatory; if it cost something, it was a positive loss to the community to the amount of that cost.

The expense of management was by no means the extent of the evil; it was a principal cause of the augmentation of the Debt. So great was the delusion that no one felt any concern about the increase of the Debt; whatever might be the amount, it was conceived the Fund would be adequate to its redemption. Hence public credit became as unlimited as public credulity. Men, in other respects enlightened, were deceived, and it would be easy to cite, from the speeches of distinguished living statesmen, the most extravagant encomiums of this great

financial error. But the subject has ceased to be of intense interest, and is chiefly valuable as an additional testimony of these epidemic aberrations to which human nature, in all ages, has been exposed. Even Lord Grenville has lived to discover and acknowledge he was deceived by the Sinking Fund; and this appears not the only error of the Pitt system, of which his lordship appears likely to survive the refutation.

But the worst part of the business still remains unnoticed; the public has not only incurred a great loss from the charge of managing the Sinking Fund, but also from the additional sums borrowed for its maintenance.

In every loan the contractors have a profit at the expense of the public, and the greater the loan the greater their gain, and consequently the public loss. From 1793, the Sinking Fund was supported by *borrowed money*; besides the loan for the public service, an additional sum was raised for the Fund. Had there been no such Fund, the annual loans would have been less by the amount of the sum paid to the commissioners for the redemption of the Debt. The question then is, supposing the sum borrowed for the Fund, since 1793, be 250 millions, how much has the public lost by the operation?

Professor Hamilton answered this question. He ascertained the total loss to the public, by annually borrowing additional loans to support the delusion of the Fund, at THIRTY MILLIONS. The interest of thirty millions, at five per cent. per annum is a million and a half. A million and a half then is the gain of the loan-contractors, and the annual loss entailed on the country by the farce of a Sinking Fund.

A question may be here asked—If we had had no Sinking Fund, in what way were we to look forward to the redemption of the Debt. Our opinion is that, in case of a surplus revenue, it ought to have been applied to the purchase of stock at the market price, and a portion of the Debt cancelled equal to the amount of stock purchased. But we are not much in favour of government having a surplus revenue to dispose of, but think it better that taxes should be remitted to the amount of the surplus; or, in case the times are favourable to an effort for the reduction of the Debt, that it should be made by a direct assessment on the community expressly for the purpose. The advocates of a surplus revenue think it tends to support public credit; but the surest mode of supporting public credit is to contribute, in all possible ways, to promote public prosperity. Public credit obviously depends on the abundance of public wealth; in other words, on the ability of the community to support the burthens necessary to pay the interest, or ultimately the principal of the debt; and this ability is augmented, not by taking money from the people, but by leaving it in their pockets: it is not by tying up capital, in a sort of mortmain, in the hands of government commissioners that national wealth is amassed, but by leaving it to be employed in the extension of commerce, manufactures, and agriculture. Every shilling levied in taxes takes from productive capital, thereby impoverishing the country, and lessening the security of the public creditor.

In short, we trust the people have learnt wisdom by experience, and they see the policy of keeping every administration in a kind of *strait waistcoat*, neither suffering them to have a surplus revenue, nor surplus military force, nor surplus power of any kind, beyond the current exigencies of the state, at their disposal. Without this precaution, the country is sure to be drawn into some wanton and profligate crusade. All governments are prone to war, because it augments patronage and emolument, and gratifies pride, insolence, and ambition. If we have not been involved in hostilities ere this, it has been more owing to the protecting *Ægis* of our pecuniary embarrassments than the absence of inclination in our rulers. Can it be supposed we should not have been embroiled about Portugal, Turkey, France, or Belgium had not the Exchequer been empty? A surplus revenue, however, under the pretext of a Sinking Fund, at all times supplies the needful, and it is easy to foresee, from past experience, were such a fund tolerated, it would be dissipated in domestic profusion or foreign aggression. As to really applying the fund to the redemption of the debt, it is mere delusion: the aristocracy, notwithstanding the solemn ejaculations of many of them about preserving, *inviolable, public faith*, have got a more efficient receipt for reducing the Debt than paying it off, as soon as the necessities of their unprincipled system demand the application.

DEAD-WEIGHT ANNUITY PROJECT.

We are induced shortly to notice this project, because it is the most recent, and, we believe, the last attempt which will ever be made to play tricks of legerdemain in matters of finance.

In the year 1822 a plan was adopted for relieving the country, in some degree, from the immediate pressure of the dead weight, by extending the payment of it over a longer series of years than the natural duration of the lives of the individuals holding half-pay, pensions, and allowances, under this denomination, would extend to. For this purpose an annuity of £2,800,000 was appropriated, out of the existing revenue, for 45 years, and vested in trustees for the discharge of the then payments, which, for that year, were estimated at £4,900,000, subject to yearly diminution by the death of annuitants. It was computed, that, according to the ordinary duration of human life, these annuities for the lives of the then holders would be equal to the annuity of £2,800,000 for forty-five years. The trustees were, therefore, empowered to sell, from time to time, such portions of this annuity as would provide the funds required for the payment of the dead weight, according to a computation made of the amount which would, probably, be due in each year. The act by which this arrangement was sanctioned took effect from the 10th of October, 1822.

The trustees failed in their first negotiation, which was entered into with some public companies, and ultimately made an engagement with the Bank of England, for supplying the funds required for six years, by the transfer to that corporation of an annuity of £585,740, part of

the above £2,800,000. The terms of the sale were settled by actuaries on either side, according to the current value of the public stocks. The sum which the Bank undertook to provide in the period specified was £13,089,419, the last payment upon which was made in July, 1828.

Now, to the measure of raising money by the sale of a temporary annuity there is no objection, when practised by the state, no more than by an individual: it may be resorted to, in order to meet an extraordinary charge; and to diffuse the charge at a diminished rate, for each year, over a longer space of time. But the framers of the dead weight expedient, sought by the means of it to create an *addition to the income of the state*, whereby a Sinking Fund of five millions might be provided, notwithstanding a considerable reduction of the taxes then existing. It was in this the delusion consisted. The money for the reduction of debt was certainly forthcoming, by the sale of the annuity, and, therefore, positively applicable to the purchase of stock in the market; but the sale of the annuity was itself a *creation of debt*, and it was, therefore, not correct to call that a Sinking Fund which only served to extinguish, in one shape, a debt which it established in another.

Such an intricate contrivance was evidently a revival, in a new shape, of the fundamental error of the Sinking Fund, namely, an attempt to extinguish debt by *borrowed money*, and, like that famous juggle, it entailed an unprofitable charge on the country for management. As the objectionable part of the project has been abandoned, under the recommendation of Sir Henry Parnell's Finance Committee, it is not necessary further to expose its fallacy. We may, also, congratulate our readers on the virtual relinquishment of the Sinking Fund; since, by the 10th Geo. IV. c. 27, which came into operation July the 5th, 1829, it is provided that the sum, in future, applicable to the reduction of the debt, shall be merely what happens to be the actual annual surplus revenue above the expenditure of the United Kingdom. The actual surplus revenue, for reasons assigned in the last section, will, we trust, be kept at a minimum.

With this remark we shall conclude our exposition of the origin and downfall of the great Sinking Fund bubble, which served to amuse and delude the country for nearly half a century. If we revert to the history of the Oligarchy, we shall find that their system has been carried on, for many years, by a series of moral, political, and financial bubbles. The French war was all a bubble. It commenced under the pretext of protecting property and averting infidelity and immorality. These, however, were mere bubbles; the real objects being to prevent reform in the representation, the administration of justice, and the tithe oppression. Abuses in all these were endangered by the principles of the revolution; but then, government could hardly go to war on the bare-faced pretext of supporting them, so they went to war on the pretext of supporting *religion* and *social order*. New circumstances require new delusions. The country is now at peace; but we shall be marvelously surprised, if some new bubble is not blown to justify interference with regenerated France and Belgium.

NEW SUGGESTIONS FOR LIQUIDATING THE DEBT.

All idea of liquidating the debt, by the operation of the Sinking Fund, being abandoned, it may be concluded, this great national incumbrance is destined to be a perpetual burthen entailed on succeeding generations. This, it must be confessed, holds out a discouraging prospect for the future. Let us, however, inquire if it be not possible to imagine a course of public affairs which would tend to the just and natural extinguishment of the debt; or, secondly, let us inquire if such changes in the monetary system of Europe may not supervene, as would constitute an equitable claim for a reduction in the amount of the annuity payable to the public creditor. Although there are few questions in public economy that have excited more intense inquiry than the progress and final issue of our funding system, still, we think, there are one or two views of the subject which have been overlooked by political writers, and which we shall beg leave briefly to submit to our reader's consideration.

Lord Goderich justly remarked, last session, that it is not the magnitude of the capital of the debt, but the amount of the dividends which form a question of interest.* A public creditor is not, like a private creditor, entitled to demand payment of both principal and interest; all to which he has a compulsory claim is the regular payment of his dividend. A greater amount of capital is only important to the public, inasmuch as it imposes a heavier burthen in the charges of management payable to the Bank of England. The vital consideration is the amount of the perpetual annuity entailed on the country: whatever tends to lessen this charge relieves the public; and let us see what system of policy would most effectually promote so desirable a consummation.

The interest of money has been gradually falling for centuries; and, from the augmentation of capital, it is not possible to assign the minimum;—it may be depressed to one, or even a half per cent.; or money may become so redundant, that, instead of the payment of interest for the use, a *premium* may be given merely for its safe custody. How far this reduction may be still carried depends entirely on the management of public affairs. Let us suppose our rulers have resolved, all at once, to carry on the government on principles of justice and wisdom, without regard to the partial interests of the Church, the Aristocracy, or any other section of society; let us suppose they are resolved to give full scope for the augmentation of national wealth, by the abolition of commercial and chartered monopolies—by the repeal of the Corn Laws, and of all such taxes and restrictions as impede the development of industry: let us suppose that government is resolved to make all reasonable concessions for the attainment of internal quiet and contentment, by the extension of the elective franchise—the improvement of the judicial administration—the abolition of partial and oppressive laws—the reduc-

* House of Lords, May 7, 1830.

tion of exorbitant salaries, the extinction of sinecures, [the rescinding of unmerited pensions, and the relinquishing of unprofitable and useless colonies : let us further suppose that government is resolved to pursue a system of impartial justice towards Ireland, remove all pretext for popular agitation, and cultivate, to the utmost advantage, her vast resources : lastly, let us suppose that government is so wholly intent on promoting the general welfare, that they are resolved to remove all restrictions on the freedom of discussion, and allow the utmost latitude, without regard to considerations personal to themselves, for the free investigation of every question in the least relevant to the public happiness ; especially of such questions as elucidate the causes of the poverty and privations of the great body of the community.

Now, supposing such a liberal and enlightened policy to be pursued by the government, the consequences would be most extraordinary. Contentment and confidence would pervade all, and, every obstacle to the full development of industry removed, commerce, manufactures, and agriculture attain an unexampled state of prosperity. The country would be inundated with wealth, and the mass of unemployed capital would be so great, that interest would be merely nominal. But would not ministers take advantage of such a favourable crisis in national affairs to reduce the debt ? Assuredly they would. All the stocks would rise above par, and they might either pay the public creditor his principal, or compel him to accept a lower rate of interest. It is in this way, merely by the operation of good government, by adopting measures to promote internal concord and prosperity, that the Three per Cents might be reduced to two, one, or even a half per cent. ; and this is what we call the *just and natural extinguishment of the Debt*.

The unsettled state of Europe may postpone for a time the decline in the interest of money ; but such is the intelligence and desire of accumulation pervading all classes, that we consider it an event of certain occurrence. Under this impression, we do not entirely concur in the wisdom of the plan adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, this year, for the conversion of the Four per Cents. Agreeably to Mr. Goulbourn's scheme, an option was given to the holders of the New Fours to accept a Five per Cent. stock, *irredeemable* for a long term of years. The chief saving to the public from this arrangement was a diminution in the amount of the capital of the debt ; but this, as before remarked, is an unimportant consideration, and only affects the amount of per centage payable to the Bank for management. The great object for a financier to aim at is a reduction in the public annuities ; but this reduction is foreclosed, by creating an irredeemable fund ; and the country is precluded from deriving advantage from the augmentation of national wealth and consequent declension of the interest of money.

Let us next advert to the other contingency to which we alluded, as likely to operate, an equitable reduction in the nominal charge of the debt—*namely, a rise throughout Europe in the value of the precious metals*. That such a rise is in progress is highly probable, for the following reasons :—1. The unsettled state of South America during the

last twenty years, and consequent interruption to the working of the gold and silver mines. 2. The increased consumption of the precious metals, from the diffusion of greater wealth and luxury. 3. The increased demand for them, owing to the increase in population, commerce, and commodities. 4. The general substitution of a metallic for a paper currency in England, America, and the continental states. All these causes obviously tend to enhance the value of the representative medium; and, should they continue to operate, they must eventually work a dissolution of money engagements; for it cannot be supposed that if a pound weight of silver attain as great an exchangeable value as in the reign of the EDWARDS, that either nations or individuals will be bound by contracts made under circumstances so widely different. Such a revolution in the monetary system, or even an approximation to it, could never have been foreseen, either by creditor or debtor; and the fulfilment of his obligations by the latter being rendered impracticable, by vicissitudes which he could neither foresee nor control, both equity and reason would relieve against them.

The practical application of this reasoning, to the reduction of the debt is too obvious to need explaining. It is a crisis wholly distinct from such as occur from the issue or withdrawal of Bank paper, or the rise or fall of mercantile credit. These are the local and ordinary fluctuations of the commercial world with which all mankind are familiar; but a rise or fall in the universal standard of value, from the general causes mentioned, is an event of a different nature. It is unnecessary, however, to pursue the subject further till the fact of a general rise in the value of the instrument of exchange has been ascertained, and the returns which the Marquis of Lansdowne moved for last session, relative to the produce of the American mines, will tend far to its elucidation.

We have thus shortly explained the two sources whence, by possibility, relief may come to this tax-paying community; but we candidly confess we have not much faith either of them will be realized. That the Oligarchy will ever pursue such a course of policy as is most likely to diffuse general intelligence, contentment, and wealth, is inconsistent with all experience of their former conduct. Unfortunately, the government only embodies the partial interests of the Aristocracy, and those interests are incompatible with the general interests of the community. Hence we conclude, the Manichæan principle of the constitution will triumph to the end of the chapter, and that the funding system will ultimately terminate by a *violent death*. The nature of its final dissolution, the hypocrisy and injustice by which it will be preceded, and the calamities it will entail on the country, we shall set forth in the next and concluding section.

CATASTROPHE OF THE FUNDING SYSTEM.

The natural and inevitable tendency of debt, either in nations or individuals, is bankruptcy. Efforts will be made, by the Oligarchy,

to avert, as long as possible, this lasting reproach of their unprincipled policy; they will try to economize in this, and retrench in that; they will be like beasts of prey environed by the hunters, they will seek escape on all sides, but, finding every outlet closed against them, they will then resort, as the only refuge from the difficulties in which they have wantonly involved themselves, to their last expedient—an *attack on the funds*. Perhaps it will not be this session of parliament, nor the next; but, that the period is approaching, we feel as confident as that we are now writing. It is the most feasible of all projects: it would attack a mass of property, and of individuals that are incapable of resistance, who are not represented, and who would sink as silently as a stone dropped into the great deep. Moreover, it would be the salvation of the system; it would not touch the Church, nor the Aristocracy, nor the Rotten Boroughs, nor the Sinecures, nor the Barracks; all the abuses of administration would be saved and perpetuated, for the affliction of the world and posterity. We do, however, trust there is sufficient justice and humanity in the nation to avert the perpetration of this national crime, which would afford complete impunity to those whose mal-administration has, alone, rendered it necessary. The man who first suggests a confiscation of the funds, under the pretext of *equitable adjustment*, unaccompanied with a radical change in our institutions, ought to be ejected from political communion as the worst enemy of Reform and the People. Let us, however, shortly consider the degree of injustice, the extent of suffering, and the misgovernment that would be perpetuated by the adoption of such a mean of surmounting the public difficulties.

Three points present themselves for consideration: 1st. The obligation imposed on the community to keep faith with the public creditor. 2d. The extent of distress and suffering which would be occasioned by a breach of this obligation. 3d. and lastly, The facilities it would afford for the perpetuation of an usurped and pernicious power.

With respect to the *first*, it is certain that funded property stands on a higher and more legitimate basis than any other description of property in the kingdom. It is created by *recent* acts of parliament, of the *meaning* and import of which there can be no difference of opinion; the present possessors of this property hold it by fair and lawful assignment, and the whole nation are *living* witnesses of the contract. The estates of the Church, of the Aristocracy, and even of individuals, are not secured and attested by such strong and solemn authority. The Church has, at least, only a *life-interest* in its possessions, and this under the express stipulation of discharging the religious duties of the community. The estates of the nobility are of extremely dubious origin, mostly obtained by plunder and confiscation, and then held under the tenure of defending the country in war, of coining money, administering justice, and preserving the peace; all which duties they have long ceased to discharge. Next, as to the estates of individuals: they have, in many instances, been obtained without valuable consideration, or are held by a fraudulent and imper-

fect title; none of which can be alleged against funded property. It follows from this that there is no description, even of *real* property, which might not be seized with a greater semblance of justice than that of the fundholder, and that any the least encroachment on the funds would be a more flagrant outrage on all those ties, by which property is made sacred and secure, than could in any other way be perpetrated.

We come next to the second consideration,—*The extent of distress and suffering consequent on a breach of faith with the national creditor.*

It is a most mistaken idea to suppose that the great mass of funded property belongs principally to monied men and capitalists. These have rarely much property in the funds; if they have, it is only a portion of their unemployed capital, which they occasionally lodge there for a few days or weeks, to accomplish some stock-jobbing speculation, or till they find for it a more profitable investment. Neither has the Aristocracy or Church considerable deposits in the funds: most of the former, from waste and extravagance, are steeped in debt and mortgage, and, notwithstanding their enormous incomes, from rents, tithes, and taxes, they have hardly a shilling to spare for necessary expenses: and the rich Clergy, from similar want of prudence and economy, are in a not less embarrassed predicament. The great bulk, therefore, of property permanently invested in the public securities is trust-property; property left for charitable uses; property belonging to suitors in Chancery; small sums belonging to officers retired from service in the army and navy; the funds of benefit societies and saving banks; and a vast number of small annuitants, consisting of minors, orphans, widows, old maids, bachelors, and families retired from business and the world, whose sole dependence is on the receipt of their half-yearly or quarterly dividends, and who, having vested the whole proceeds of a weary life on the faith of the nation, any attack on the funds would, to them, be as sudden and overwhelming as a stroke of lightning.

On this part of the subject we have authentic data to proceed; we know, from accounts laid before parliament, the number of public annuitants, and the amount of property vested in the funds on account of benefit societies, saving banks, and suitors in Chancery. From a parliamentary paper, (No. 41, Session 1830,) it appears the total number of persons receiving half-yearly dividends, on the different stocks, constituting the Public Debt, amounts to 274,823; of which number there were who received,—

Not exceeding	£5	83,609	persons.
Not exceeding	10	42,227	ditto.
Not exceeding	50	97,307	ditto.
Not exceeding	100	26,316	ditto.
Not exceeding	200	15,209	ditto.
Not exceeding	300	4,912	ditto.
Not exceeding	500	3,077	ditto.
Not exceeding	1000	1,555	ditto.

Not exceeding	2000	450 ditto.
Exceeding	2000	161 ditto.

Several annuitants have property in two or more separate stocks, as in the three per cents. and three-and-a-half per cents. so as to receive dividends quarterly: suppose nearly one-third are of this description, and, instead of 274,823, there are only 200,000 national creditors, who share among them the whole interest of twenty-eight millions, payable on the public debt; in which case, each receives, on an average, only £140 a-year.

Think of the consequence of extinguishing, or even abridging these petty incomes! What impoverishment and destitution it would create among widows, orphans, the aged, and infirm. How many funds, destined for charitable uses, or for mutual assurance against misfortune, and amassed with difficulty out of the earnings of the industrious, would be violated! From official returns, in 1829, it appears there are, in the United Kingdom, half a million of contributors to Saving-banks, whose deposits amount to upwards of 17 millions. The number of members of friendly societies, in 1815, amounted to 925,429;* and the property belonging to them, vested in the funds, amounted to 40 millions. These funds have been raised and guaranteed by special acts of parliament, so that to encroach on them would be a shameless and flagrant violation of the public engagements.

It is not, however, the public annuitants only that would suffer by the measure we are considering; the calamity in its direct and indirect consequences would fall almost exclusively on the middling and industrious orders. Nearly the whole interest payable on the Debt is expended in support of the domestic trade, manufactures, and agriculture of the kingdom. A large portion of the revenue of the higher classes is consumed abroad, in the support of menial servants, or in articles of luxury, which create hardly any traffic or employment; whereas, the incomes of the public annuitants are chiefly spent among ourselves, in the employment of the artisan and labourer, and in dealings with the grocer, baker, butcher, linen-draper, victualler, builder, carpenter, &c. It follows that any diminution in a revenue so expended would inflict incalculable mischief on the whole internal trade and economy; it would be the most hurtful of all remedies that could be applied to our embarrassments; for there is no other description of property, the violation of which would cause such wide-spread misery, distress, and mercantile stagnation. A man, therefore, who brings forward such a scheme must not only be an enemy to the general welfare, but he must be thoroughly depraved, and an alien to all those principles of justice and feelings of humanity which fit an individual for social communion and intercourse.

We come to the third and last consideration, namely,—*The facilities a breach of national faith would afford for the perpetuation of usurped and pernicious power.*

* Parliamentary Report, No. 522, Session 1825.

If established authority be adverse to the general interests, whatever tends to its continuance and support is pernicious;—whatever adds to the power of the weak and unprincipled is criminal. If the government of this country be so administered as to be unjust and oppressive, whatever tends to avert its reform, or prolong its existence, must be reprobated by every patriotic mind. Now it is certain that, to tolerate any, the least, attack on the funds, would place an uncontrolled and almost unlimited power at the mercy of the administration. Should ministers be once allowed openly to reduce, or to tax the public annuities, or to encroach upon them under any form, they would possess an inexhaustible resource for domestic profusion and future war. The whole interest of the Debt would be at their mercy, and, in gradually reducing it, they would have the means, for a century longer, to pursue the same career of folly and injustice which they had pursued in the century that is past. Thus the Debt, instead of an incumbrance, would be a real treasure, to which they could resort on every emergency. No matter how small the tax at first imposed; if the principle be once admitted, they might gradually augment their exactions on the public creditor; the machinery would be made, and would only require *working*; in a word, it would be merely retaining the money in their own hands, instead of paying it half-yearly to the fundholder.

The first step in this proceeding would be the most delicate, and require great caution and considerable hypocrisy in the execution. First, probably, only a tax of one per cent. or even a quarter per cent. would be proposed, accompanied with deep expressions of regret on the imperious necessity that had rendered necessary such a painful alternative. Having got the handle to the axe, they would proceed with a slow but sure step, screwing up the fund-tax, like the income-tax, till at length it equalled, in amount, the dividends, or, in a word, expunged the Debt!

Such a villanous procedure would, doubtless, raise a great outcry; many would exclaim against the violation of *public faith*, and of the injustice of sacrificing *a part to the whole*; but ministers would easily find excuses. They would first eat up all their former declarations on the great advantages of *national integrity*, and would expatiate on the great advantages of *national bankruptcy*. They would plead the alteration in the currency as one pretext for their injustice; they would urge the great law of *self preservation*, which forbids either individuals or nations to bind themselves to their own destruction; they would enlarge on the impolicy and unreasonableness of adhering to engagements that would destroy the sources of productive industry, and, ultimately, entail ruin on all classes, even the annuitants themselves. Lastly, they would plead the example of other states, of their “*magnanimous and august allies*,”—the members of the Holy Alliance,—all of whom had been once or twice bankrupt, and necessitated to compound with their creditors. The knavery and sophistry of such reasoning would be apparent to all; but the *majority* being benefited by the injustice, it is probable they would be inclined to wink at the trans-

action, and the poor fundholder become the scape-goat of the community.

It may appear improbable, at first sight, that a government, founded on the basis of a regard to "property, morality, religion," and an abhorrence of "blasphemy," should resort to such a disgraceful expedient, to such unprincipled sophistry; especially, too, as a breach of national faith would be a violation of the principle to which they have been accustomed, on all occasions, to ascribe the prosperity, glory, and independence, of the empire. This, certainly, at first view, appears improbable; but, if we examine the subject more closely, we shall find that it is not without precedent, and that it would be less inconsistent with former *practices* than former *professions* of our rulers.

First, there is the Bank Restriction Act of 1797. This measure, in its nature, was full as unprincipled an attack on the rights of private property and the sacredness of previous engagements as a breach of national faith could possibly be. Secondly, there are various suspensions of the Habeas Corpus Act—the passing of bills of indemnity for all sorts of crimes—the forging of French assignats—the Irish Union—the attack of Copenhagen—the blowing up of the Spanish ships, and the affair of Terceira: all these measures are so atrocious, so repugnant to every principle of law, humanity, and justice, that it would be chimerical, in the highest degree, to suppose that the men who could advise and participate in them, would be scrupulous in the observance of their engagements with the public creditor.

Yet the shame, the disgrace, the infamy of a breach of faith would be so great; it would lay bare so completely the unprincipled policy of the last forty years; it would so entirely unmask the nature of the Borough System, exposing its authors to such execration and derision, that we may expect it to be staved off to the last day; and when, at length, it is attempted, it will be disguised, under a thousand pretexts, to hide its deformity from the world. Come, however, it must; for there is no other alternative they are likely to adopt; the contest now is betwixt rent and tithe on one hand, and the payment of the dividends on the other: to pay the latter the former must be sacrificed. But can any one doubt the issue of the conflict? Can it be doubted which party will go to *the wall*? The lords of the soil possess all *political power*; they have the boroughs, the barracks, and the powder-mills at their command; they will take care of *THEMSELVES*; and, judging from the acts we have enumerated, there is no reason to suppose their love of justice is so extreme as to induce them to abandon their *ALL* to preserve, inviolate, public faith.

Before, however, the fundholders are sacrificed, all other classes will be *degraded*: so loth will be the Boroughmongers to touch their great stalking-horse of public credit, that they will endeavour to support it on the ruins of the other orders of society. First, probably, as being most exposed to their attacks, the poor-rate will be attempted; next, in order, come the other *unrepresented* interests of the community, the profits of all the productive classes—the farmers, merchants, and trades-

men. If the degradation of these classes, if the appropriation of the whole of their revenue, except that portion necessary to a bare subsistence, be insufficient, then the fundholder will be assailed, rather than rent and tithe should be materially reduced. This is what we call the CATASTROPHE OF THE FUNDING SYSTEM. All classes will be sacrificed to the preservation of the Aristocracy. When the full payment of the dividends encroaches on the sources of their own incomes, they will be forcibly reduced, and the only favour shown to the fundholder will be that of being *last devoured*!

We have thus briefly traced what appears likely to be the catastrophe of the funding system, the consequences of an attack on the funds, its flagrant injustice, the distress and suffering it would occasion, and the lasting impunity it would afford to corruption and mis-government. We were anxious to do this at the present moment, because it appears highly probable the time is fast approaching, when the desperate expedient of robbing the fundholder will be tried, in order to silence the cry of a starving population for economy and reform. We trust, however, the people will be on their guard against this horrible project; like all frauds, it will be clandestinely and insidiously introduced; therefore it behoves them to be constantly on the alert. So long as the Debt is *safe*, it is the best ally of Reform, but the moment it is violated, it is the best ally of Corruption.

If a general sacrifice be required to save the country, a change in the representation is an indispensable preliminary. The House of Commons, in lieu of representing the people, represents only the government which it ought to control, in the various branches of the executive, the aristocracy, the church, the army, navy, and public offices. Embodying such partial interests, the general weal must be invariably compromised, and no equitable settlement can be made. Admit the intelligence and property of the nation to have their due weight in the public councils, and the best and most salutary measures must necessarily be adopted, and equity and safety found for all.

This is all the people require; they do not want *pity* nor *charity*; and those who, during their periodical sufferings, are constantly preaching PATIENCE to a famishing population, would do well to change the word for JUSTICE from their rulers. Justice from oppression is a *virtue*; patience under undeserved suffering a *crime*.

ABUSES

IN THE

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

THE labours of Mr. Hume, Sir James Graham, and Sir Henry Parnell, are an instance of what the ability and perseverance of a few individuals may accomplish, even in the House of Commons as at present constituted. "His Majesty's opposition," as the remnant of Whiggism was aptly termed by the late Mr. Tierney, must be heartily ashamed of their former inefficiency, and, doubtless, feel some mortification in beholding these obscure members effect in a few sessions all they had been talking about for years. It is not, however, so much the good which has been effected as the evil prevented that entitles them to the gratitude of the country. Under "the long, leaden," and unprofitable administration of Lord Liverpool, all the great branches of public expenditure had been annually augmenting; and how far this progression would have extended, had not Mr. Hume, supported by a small phalanx of honest persons, commenced his exposures, it is impossible to say. His mode of attack could not be resisted: though an unofficial man himself, he showed as intimate acquaintance with the details of the public accounts as those who had been all their lives in office. Even Sir T. Gooch and Lord Wharncliffe were constrained to admit the value of his services, and the reductions effected in the public service are chiefly attributable to him and the gentlemen we have mentioned.

In the course of this chapter we purpose to bring together some of the more palpable abuses in the government expenditure, and for a knowledge of many of which the public is indebted to a valuable work of Sir Henry Parnell, *On Financial Reform*. We intend to avail ourselves of this gentleman's seasonable publication, though we cannot say the member for Queen's County is an object of our exclusive admiration: he is too much of a *doctrinaire* for us, and appears to repose too implicit confidence in the dogmas of the Ricardo school,—the disciples of which know as much about the internal state of the country, and the

causes and remedies of its embarrassments, as the natives of Kampt-schatka. However, this infirmity of the honourable baronet does not impair the utility of the facts he has published, nor depreciate the important information collected by the Finance Committee of 1828, over which he so ably presided.

The following is Sir Henry Parnell's list of the several departments entrusted with the business of expending the public money, pursuant to the general appropriation of it by parliament:—

1. The Treasury, including the Commissariat Department in 1827, £80,542	
2. The Exchequer	48,000
3. The Audit-Office in 1828	32,977
4. The Bank of England, do.	267,597
5. The Commissioners of the Sinking Fund, do.	10,350
6. The Civil Department of the Army, do.	108,837
7. Do. of the Navy, do.	179,647
8. Do. of the Ordnance (the Tower and Pall Mall,) do.	57,961

£779,911

The expense of the treasury department was, in 1797, only £44,066; so that it has nearly doubled; although the revenue, the superintending of which constitutes the chief business of the treasury, was as great as in 1827. Does not this show the profusion with which salaries have been increased, and offices multiplied? There are no fewer than fifteen clerks in the treasury, who receive salaries amounting to £1000; five of these fifteen receive £1,500 a year each and upwards. Their duties are little more than nominal; they seldom attend their offices but to look over the newspapers; many of them hold two or more offices and sinecures; yet with all their official appointments, so little are they engaged in the public service, that they may be mostly seen driving about town in their stanhopes, and whiling their time in the club-houses. The Duke of Wellington has been always represented as an active functionary and great economist; but what can he be doing to tolerate so many overpaid and superfluous *employés* in his own department?

The Exchequer.—This is one of the most abused and lucrative offices under government. As the chief duty of the exchequer is that of superintendence, in taking care that there are no issues of public money by the treasury, contrary to parliamentary direction, it ought to be discharged by a very few officers, or altogether abolished. However, neither economy nor common sense are objects sought to be attained. The forms by which business is carried on are extremely antiquated and absurd, and as remote from modern practice as the conveyance of merchandize by packhorse and bells is from the cheapness and despatch of a rail-road. Our limits will only admit of a brief description of the constitution of this department, and the mummery and nonsense daily perpetrated there.

The exchequer is divided into seven different departments; the ellers, the pells, the king's remembrancers, the lord treasurer's, the

auditor's office, the tally-court, and the pipe-office. The pipe-office alone has seven subsidiary absurdities; among these are the clerk of the nichills, the clerk of the estreats, and the cursitor baron; besides which, are eight sworn-attornies, two board-end clerks, and eight clerks attached to the sworn attornies. From the inquiries of a parliamentary commission in 1824, it seems these are nearly all sinecurists. Two of the witnesses examined had been in the office, one eight and the other twenty-five years, and they stated, during that time, five out of the eight attornies never came near the office, living in the country at a considerable distance from London. The duties of their clerks were not more onerous. Three of them were at school long after being appointed to their situations. One of them admitted that, subsequently to his nomination, he was five years at school at Chelsea, two years in a conveyancer's office, and that he now practised as a barrister, and might look into the office once in a month. The board-end clerks laboured under similar lack of duties; and as to the clerk of the nichills, the name is sufficient to indicate his heavy and responsible functions.

One of the duties of the exchequer is, yearly to send down five great rolls of parchment to the sheriffs, containing accounts of supposed debtors to the crown during the last 300 years. The sheriff is bound to summon a jury, in order to ascertain what money is due to the crown on the roll. The sending of the roll down and up again, occasions an expense of £15, and is as useless a task as the labours of Sisyphus. The farcical ceremony of passing the sheriffs' accounts is of a piece with the rest, and resembles a game on the draught-board. Under the pretence of testing the account, the practice is to throw, in the presence of the cursitor baron, small copper coins behind a hat, from one little square of the cloth on the table to another; when the sheriffs' accounts are correct, a person cries out "*tot*;" when inaccurate, another person cries "*nel*;" and according as these words are uttered, the copper coins are shifted from one part of the chequers to another. All these antics were, probably, of use prior to the invention of arithmetic and book-keeping, but are now as irrelevant as the idle pageant of a coronation or lord-mayor's show.

The manner in which the public money is paid in to the tellers is a similar burlesque on real life. There are four tellers, and each has a little pew or cabin, in which he or his deputy sits, with a suitable complement of clerks, for the purpose of receiving the produce of the taxes nominally paid to him, but in reality to the clerks of the Bank of England, three of whom attend in an adjoining room to receive the money paid out of the Bank to be paid into the Bank again. The tellers, under the mockery of receiving the stamp, excise, and other duties, sign a parchment, written in a mixture of Latin or Saxon, or other jargon, which no one but a teller can understand.* They next pass a roll through a pipe into a room below, and there it is cut into a parti-

* Mr. R. Gordon, House of Commons, May 14, 1830.

cular shape, and carried to the auditors of the exchequer. A wooden tally was formerly used, which, within the last twelvemonth, has been exchanged for one of parchment. But the inconvenience and absurdity of the formality is so great, that ministers have latterly abolished exchequer payments, and they are now managed by clerks of the treasury.

From Madox's *History of the Court of Exchequer*, it appears, scarcely any alteration has been made in this department since the reign of Henry II. The reason is obvious enough. There are vested rights, claims of seniority, and reversionary interests in the way; and no reform can be introduced till all these expectancies are satisfied, and ministers take special care such expectancies never shall be satisfied, by promptly filling up, with their friends and connexions, every vacant appointment the moment it occurs. The most valuable sinecures in the exchequer are held by peers and their relatives, and the emolument, fees, and patronage are so great, that it can hardly excite surprise the carnival doings we have described have been so carefully preserved. We subjoin a statement of a few of the exchequer offices from a parliamentary paper, No. 480, Session 1830.

Lord Grenville, Auditor of the Exchequer,	£4,000
G. C. Bedford, First Clerk to Auditor	1,200
Earl Bathurst, Teller ditto,	2,700
Hon. Spencer Percival, Teller ditto	2,700
Right Hon. Charles Yorke, Teller ditto,	2,700
Marquess Camden, Teller ditto	2,700
Hon. W. L. Bathurst, and the other Clerks to the Tellers, each..	1,000
D. M. Percival, and the other Under Clerks to the Tellers, each	800
H. Ellis, Clerk of the Pells,	1,400
William H. Roberts, Clerk of Exitus	1,050
Charles Stevens, Second Clerk of Introitus	950
T. Forster, Clerk of Debentures	900
A. Bulley, Clerk of the Issues	750

The Audit Office.—This is as snug and delightful a retreat as any under the borough system. Were a proper system adopted in keeping the public accounts, this office might be dispensed with. In 1806, the Whigs set about *improving* the audit department, and the way they went to work is a very apt specimen of their peculiar mode of reforming government abuses. They created a chairman of the board, salary £1,500; four new members, each £1,200; a secretary, a foreigner, £1,000; six inspectors, each £600; and eight additional examiners; with numerous other appointments, which increased the expense from about £14,000 to £38,000; and after all, the establishment was made less efficient than under the old and less expensive system.

Civil Department of the Army.—The office of paymaster of the forces is a sinecure. The business is performed by a deputy and three cashiers. As each of these persons has a power of drawing money out of the Bank of England on his own order, the effect of the office being

a sinecure is to diminish considerably the security of the public.* It is also attended with this further inconvenience, that it multiplies the number of imprest accountants, and thus augments the difficulty of establishing a proper system of keeping the public accounts.

The account called *Army Extraordinaries* is liable to great abuse and mystification. Under this head, payments are made which have nothing to do with the army; the sum voted by parliament seldom exceeds £900, while the sum expended commonly amounts to three millions. This scheme serves to conceal from the public a great deal of wasteful and illegal expenditure; for instance, the sum paid at home to colonial agents, and the sum drawn from abroad for colonial expenses, although they are wholly for civil colonial purposes, are paid as army extraordinaries, and without any previous vote of parliament; which is thus, according to the testimony of Sir H. Parnell, misled by the annual production of an account with "a perfectly false title."

The employing of *Commissioners of Accounts* abroad was suggested in consequence of the great accumulation of accounts during the war; but, since the conclusion of it, the motives which originated the plan have gradually ceased to have any force, and therefore the public ought to be saved the expense of such useless functionaries. Where too is the necessity for incurring the expense of having *army agents*? The accounts of the paymasters of regiments are examined at the War-office, and not by the agents; and all the agents do for the public is to receive money from the paymasters of the forces, and to pay with it the drafts of the regimental paymasters: the other duties are private, and for the benefit of officers of the army.

Civil Department of the Navy.—The first lord commissioner of the admiralty has a salary of £5,000, and four other commissioners £1,000 a-year each; the first secretary £3,000, the second do 1,500; the comptroller of the navy has £2,000, the deputy-comptroller of ditto, £1,200; besides which, are an immense number of commissioners of the navy, and commissioners of the dock-yards with salaries of £1,000 each. But the most objectionable office, is the treasurership of the navy with a salary of £3,000. According to the evidence of Mr. Keith Douglas, before the Committee of Finance, it is merely a nominal office without any necessary duties to discharge, and without any responsibility. The office being a sinecure, the business of it is done by a paymaster and three cashiers, who have power to draw for money on the Bank of England.

In the *Royal Dock Yards* is a lavish expenditure in commissioners, storekeepers, clerks, chaplains, surgeons, measurers, master-attendant, master-shipwright and others, many of whom are apparently kept up for mutual superintendence, and forming a gradation of office and multiplication of expense wholly unnecessary. Not a single trade is carried on without a master; there is a master-smith, bricklayer, sail-maker,

* Sir H. Parnell on Financial Reform, p. 141.

rigger, rope-maker, painter, and others; they have each £250 a-year, and many of them have not above four or five men under their superintendence. How differently private and public business is conducted, was strikingly shown in the evidence of Mr. Barrow. There is a private builder who employs 250 shipwrights: he has one foreman, one measurer, two clerks, and ten labourers. In Woolwich yard, which comes the nearest to it, there are 248 shipwrights, eighteen clerks, six masters' of trades, eight foremen, eight measurers, eleven cabin-keepers; besides surgeons, boatswain, wardens, and other people. The whole establishment of the officers, clerks, and other salaried persons at the dock-yard, amounts to £155,000, and the amount of wages paid for work done by artificers, and labourers, &c. is £502,000. It thus appears, that for every three pounds and a quarter paid to the men, there is a pound paid for superintendence.

The *Paymaster of the Marines* has a salary of £1,000, for the discharge of duties which might be very well annexed to the Navy-office. "As to the reasons," says Sir H. Parnell, "that are given to the contrary, they are so plainly nothing more than ingenious pretexts for maintaining a lucrative office, that it would be a waste of time to notice them."

The naval accounts, as indeed all the accounts of the public offices, are kept on a confused and most inconvenient principle, from the want of a well-arranged plan of book-keeping. Each description of expenditure has its distinct set of books, making thirty-three in all, and tending greatly to the increase of expense by the multiplication of clerks. At present the payment of officers and seamen's wages is made in the presence of four clerks, in order to have three clerks checking the accuracy of every sum paid by the fourth. As these clerks are selected from different branches, and as each keeps a book, so many books are kept in triplicate, that they amount, in the whole, to 1580 supernumerary volumes.

Increase in Peace Establishments.—The following comparison of the peace establishments of 1792 and of 1830 is very instructive.

	Year 1792.		Year 1830.
Army	£2,330,349	£ 7,709,372
Navy	1,985,482	5,902,339
Ordnance	444,863	1,569,150
Total charge....	<u>£4,760,694</u>	<u>£15,280,757*</u>

It thus appears the peace establishment of 1830 exceeds that of 1792 more than threefold, and that, since 1815, upwards of 230 millions have been expended on soldiers, sailors, ships, and artillery; although we have been all the time in a state of general tranquillity. The only ground on which it is attempted to justify the expenditure, so enormously great in comparison with that of any former peace establishment, is the expediency of being at *all times prepared for war.*† So that after

* Annual Finance Accounts, p. 19.

† Financial Reform, p. 213.

expending upwards of eleven hundred millions in the purchase of a secure and lasting peace ; after sacrificing millions in fortifying Belgium against French aggression ; after erecting splendid and costly monuments to commemorate the glorious triumphs of Waterloo : after all these efforts, glories, and sacrifices, we cannot yet sit down in safety, without bristling on all sides with cannons and bayonets. Is this, we ask, any proof of progression in human affairs ? Is this the boasted "*settlement of Europe* ?" Are these the blessings of legitimate and constitutional monarchies ? Are nations, in their relations to each other, always to exemplify the condition of man in a state of nature, with couched lance, watchful eye, and trembling heart, fearing to be the victim of beasts of prey or of the tomahawk and scalping-knife of his not less savage fellow-creature ? If these are all the guarantees of social happiness which aristocratic governments can give, we say,—Away with them ! let us try new men, new principles, and new institutions !

A principal cause of the vast increase in the military expenditure of the country is the number and establishments of the army. From the inquiries of the Finance Committee, it appears that, in 1792, the number of all ranks in the army was 57,251 ; and that, according to the statement of Sir H. Parnell, they were distributed as follows :—

	Officers and Men.
Great Britain	17,007
Ireland	11,901
East Indies	10,700
Canada, Nova Scotia, and Bermuda.....	6,061
Gibraltar	4,221
West-India Islands	6,886
New South Wales	475
	<hr/>
	57,251
	<hr/>

In 1828, the number of all ranks was 116,738 ; the distribution was as follows :—

Great Britain	29,616
Ireland	23,969
Colonies	37,037
East Indies	26,116
	<hr/>
	116,738
	<hr/>

The chief part of the increase is accounted for as under :—

Increase in the New Colonies	17,112
Increase in the Old Colonies	849
Increase in Great Britain	9,094
Increase in Ireland.....	10,363
Increase in the East Indies	14,287
	<hr/>
	51,705
	<hr/>

Allowing that the extent of our foreign possessions has rendered necessary an increase in the army, this does not apply to the *household troops*, as they are never sent abroad in time of peace. Yet it is in this branch of the service, and in dragoons, that there has been the greatest augmentation. The following statement shows the increase of life and foot guards and cavalry at the two periods:—

	RANK and FILE.		Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers in 1830.	Total of Men and Officers in 1830.	Increase in Rank and File in 1830.
	1792.	1830.			
Life Guards	411	688	187	875	277
Horse Guards ..	261	344	86	430	83
Dragoon Guards.	696	2,268	1,506	9,326	1,972
Dragoons	2,080	5,152			
Foot Guards....	3,126	5,760	848	6,608	2,634
Total Number ..	6,574	14,212	2,627	17,239	8,038

These are the most expensive classes in the army, and chiefly kept for *domestic use*. The sums saved by the reduction of the cavalry force would be very considerable, since the expenses of every horseman are nearly as great as those of the junior clerks in the public offices, some of whom have been so unsparingly reduced that their superiors might enjoy, undiminished, their overgrown emoluments. The expense of a dragoon and horse, exclusive of forage, &c. is £57 a year, and of a life and horse guardsman £75 a year; whilst the charge for infantry of the line is only £31 per man.

The guards are chiefly intended for the maintenance of the peace in the Metropolis, for the protection of the Bank, the Tower, and royal palaces. But there can be less need of this expensive corps now we have a military police, for the security of property and persons, and ready to aid the established authorities in case of civil commotion. Surely 4000 constables, trained, organised, and barracked, and under the entire control of Ministers, might enable them to dispense with at least one regiment of the household force.

Many millions have been unnecessarily expended, since the Peace, on our maritime establishments. Last year, 30,000 seamen were voted, and £1,657,601 to defray the charges of their wages and victuals. With the exception of Russia and the United States, the naval force of every other power is less than at the breaking out of the war in 1793. Neither Spain nor Holland has any navy of consequence; and France, which, at the commencement of the Revolution, had eighty efficient ships of the line, has now not more than forty. What occasion, then, can there be for Great Britain to expend annually £1,300,000 on her dock-yards, and incur a naval expenditure, altogether, of more than five millions?

Expenditure of the Colonies.—These are a tremendous burthen on the resources of the mother country, chiefly to provide governorships, secretaryships, registrarships, agencies, and sinecures for the Aristocracy and their connexions. No parliamentary documents shew what the whole expense is that is paid by English taxes on account of the colonies. It is generally estimated that from two to three millions are paid for the army, navy, and various civil charges; but, in addition to this, the public pay full two millions more for sugar and timber than they ought to pay, in consequence of the increased prices occasioned by the protection given to the colonists by the higher duties imposed on these articles when imported from foreign countries.*

There are only three ways that the colonies can be of any advantage. 1. In furnishing a military force; 2. In supplying the parent state with a revenue; 3. In affording commercial advantages.

Instead of furnishing a military force, the colonies are always a great drain upon our military resources, particularly in war, when they occupy a large portion of the army and fleet in their defence. With respect to revenue, it has been declared, by the act of the 18 Geo. III. that no taxes or duties shall be levied on the colonies, except *for their use*. As to commercial advantages, if the colonial trade were quite free, our commercial relations with the colonies would resemble the intercourse between ourselves and independent countries; and, with our unrivalled superiority in capital, manufactures, machinery, and skill, what have we to fear from unrestricted competition? What have we lost by the independence of the United States? Nothing: the nobility have lost provincial governorships; but the population of both countries has been enriched and benefited by the vast augmentation in their mercantile intercourse.

The rage for colonization has been one of the great big blunders of our national policy, originating in the vain glory of conquest and aristocratic cupidity. England has neither conferred nor derived social happiness from territorial acquisitions. We may have imparted strength to others, but have received in return only the decrease of monopolies and vast individual accumulations. How, indeed, could the results have been more favourable? A great nation, possessing within herself the resources of wealth and civilization, what advantage can she derive from exhausting her energies in rearing to maturity and fostering ingratitude in the unfledged offspring of future empires? Between old and infant communities there is not equal reciprocity of interest; the latter participate in the benefits of the experience, laws, institutions, warlike power, and riches of the former without yielding countervailing advantages: it is strength allying itself to weakness—the full-grown oak bending to the palsyng embrace of the creeping ivy.

So convinced are we of the fatuity of our conduct in this respect, that we are sometimes inclined to think that we should have been a

* Sir Henry Parnell on Financial Reform, p. 234.

happier community had our sway never extended over the border. Scotland has benefited by the Union: her soil has been fertilised by our capital, and her greedy sons have enriched themselves by sinecures and pensions, the produce of English taxes; but what has England gained from the connexion? The generous and intellectual character of her Saxon race has not been improved by amalgamation with Scotch metaphysics, thrift, and servility. Again, what benefits have we derived from the conquest of Ireland? Her uncultivated wastes, too, will be made fruitful by English money, unless the connexion be prematurely severed: but what boon, in return, can she confer on England? Her miserable children have poured out their blood in our wars of despotism; our rich Aristocracy have been made richer by the rental of her soil; and the aggregate power of the empire has been augmented: but we seek in vain for the benefits communicated to the mass of the English population. Certainly we do not recognise them in the degraded situation of the "men of Kent," depressed by competition with the Hibernian peasantry; neither have the moral habits of our rural and manufacturing population been bettered by commingling with the wretched and half-civilized immigrants from Munster and Connaught.

But these, at best, are only unprofitable speculations; it is vain to repine at remediless evils; the union of England, Scotland, and Ireland, is, we presume, indissoluble: we are married, as the saying is, for better and worse, and we must make the best of an unprofitable alliance.

The chief advantage to be derived from colonies is in rendering them a desirable refuge to a redundant population. But the Aristocracy decline making them subservient to the purposes of emigration, because *of the expense*; it would be a sacrifice not for the benefit of themselves, but of the industrious orders, and this they begrudge; they prefer subduing the clamour of hunger by coercive measures to providing the means by which the unemployed labourer and artisan might transport his superfluous industry to the banks of the St. Lawrence and the shores of Australia.

Although the Oligarchs are so parsimonious when the welfare of the people is concerned, they are reckless enough about expense when it ministers only indirectly to their own gratification and ambition. It appears, from the inquiries of the Finance-Committee, that the collective expenditure of five of our colonies has exceeded, on an account of ten and more years, the colonial revenues applicable to the discharge of it, so as to have constituted a deficiency of £2,524,000, and that this deficiency was paid by the Treasury, although the surplus expenditure had been incurred without previous communication with ministers; nor does it appear ministers had any previous knowledge either of the amount of the colonial revenues or the charges upon them. Can any thing more strikingly show the careless and lavish system on which the affairs of the nation are conducted? We subjoin an abstract of the returns to parliament of the colonies to which we have alluded. It will be seen

that the surplus revenue of the crown colonies above the civil expenditure amounted to £1,453,842, and this was all which remained applicable to a military expenditure of £3,733,939, leaving £2,280,097 to be paid out of the assessed taxes, the excise, and custom-duties of the people of England.

Statement of the Revenue and Expenditure of Five Crown Colonies referred to in Mr. Herries's Letter to Mr. Wilmot Horton, of the 24th March, 1827.—Parl. Paper, No. 352, Sess. 1830.

Colonies.	Years.	Revenue.	Civil Expenditure.	Military Expenditure.
Ceylon	13	4,384,407	3,097,571	2,570,107
Mauritius	12	1,723,114	1,829,598	795,575
Cape of Good Hope ..	11	1,333,441	1,062,670	277,015
Malta	10	2,378,114	2,384,197	88,994
Trinidad	12	405,513	396,711	2,248
		£10,224,589	8,770,747	3,733,939

Of these colonies, three of them—Ceylon, Mauritius, and the Cape of Good Hope—are only of use to the East-India Company, who ought to defray the charges of their military protection. Many other of our colonies are equally valueless as objects of national utility. Of what use is the retention of the Ionian Islands, with Malta and Gibraltar in our hands? The settlements at Sierra Leone and on the west coast of Africa ought to be abandoned, having entirely failed in the attainment of the object intended. No reason can be shown why Canada, Nova-Scotia, and other possessions on the continent of America, would not be as available to British enterprise, if they were made independent states. Neither our manufactures, commerce, nor shipping would be injured by such a measure. On the other hand, what has the nation lost by Canada? According to Sir H. Parnell, fifty or sixty millions have been already expended; the annual sum payable out of English taxes is full £600,000 a-year; and there has been a plan in progress for two or three years to fortify Canada, at an estimated cost of three millions. Are the boroughmongers mad, or are the people mad, to tolerate their lavish proceedings?

The Slave-Trade.—On this subject, Sir H. Parnell says—"The great sum of £5,700,000 has already been expended in carrying into effect the measures of government for co-operating with other countries in putting down the slave-trade, and the annual current expenses amount to nearly £400,000. But the attempt appears to have altogether failed. The governments of France, Spain, and Portugal, according to the Parliamentary Papers, make no efforts whatever to enforce the laws for putting down the traffic; and the persons in authority in Cuba and Brazil not only neglect to execute the laws, but, in some

cases, have been engaged in it themselves. So that our treaties and laws, where such parties are concerned, are so much waste paper, and spending money to try to give effect to them is perfect folly. The African Institution say, in their twentieth report, ‘The slave-trade has increased during the last year; and, notwithstanding the number of prizes taken, it continues to rage with unabated fury.’ Surely here are sufficient reasons for saving £400,000 a-year, now expended to so little purpose.”—*Financial Reform*, pp. 231, 232. Whether this melancholy result is the consequence of inadequate efforts to enforce the Abolition-Laws, we are not sufficiently informed to determine, but we do trust nothing will be done—not even for the sake of economy—tending to revive the hellish traffic.

Expense of Civil Government.—The expense of conducting the civil government of the country, including the king, the three secretaries of state, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, the Mint, and judicial establishments, is about £2,000,000. The progressive increase of expense, in some departments, is as follows:—

	Year 1796.	Year 1829.
Home Department	£ 14,423	£ 31,916
Foreign Department	34,495	65,681
Colonial Department	9,111	39,824
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	£ 58,019	£ 137,221
	<hr/>	<hr/>

Thus, it appears, the charge of these three departments has more than doubled since 1796—a period of hostilities.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.—The vice-regal government of Ireland costs the country £100,000 per annum. This is wholly unnecessary, as it is well known that Irish affairs are managed at Whitehall. The only use of this mimic sovereign is to keep up those symbols of separation and hostility which a more rational policy would endeavour to obliterate. For any other purpose, in the present state of intercourse, we might as well have, once more, a lord-president at York—a king in Edinburgh—or a separate court for the marches of Wales, at Ludlow, or Monmouth. What then can be urged to justify the lord-lieutenancy? It is said, by Lord Leveson Gower,—and we suppose the argument will be renewed next session by his successor, Sir Henry Hardinge,—that it is beneficial to the tradesmen of Dublin, among whom the money granted for the vice-regal establishment is expended. So then the community must be robbed of £100,000, that the Dublin shopkeepers may profit the odd farthings. This is the favourite round of arguing by corruptionists; they always deem it a sufficient justification for pillaging the people, if a portion of the spoil be returned to them in the way of alms or Christmas doles. By acting on this principle, the pride and interests of an aristocratical government are both favoured; and the people, injured by its rapacity, are insulted by its compassion. But in this way the influence of the lord-lieutenant’s salary is, as regards the prosperity of a great city, contemptible: his whole salary, if spent in Dublin, is

not equal to half the receipts of one of the ten thousand gin-shops in London. If, however, the effect was greater, the process is dishonest. If the lord-lieutenancy is necessary as an instrument of government—which has never been proved—it ought to be retained; if not, there is no earthly reason why the shopkeepers of Dublin should be supported by taxing the shopkeepers of the other towns of the empire. The viceroyship is a precious jewel in the eyes of the Aristocracy, and that it will not willingly be abandoned, we believe; but where pretexts are seen through easily, it is, perhaps, prudent to abstain from them. The man who merely robs you, does not offend you so much as the man who both robs you and insults your understanding by an awkward attempt at deceiving you.

Expenses of a Coronation.—It is to be hoped this suffering and oppressed community will be saved, among other retrenchments, the expense of this feudal pageant. The ministers of George IV. asked Parliament for a grant of only £100,000, to defray the expenses of the coronation of the late king; but the ceremony turned out something like palace-building, the actual cost greatly exceeding the estimate, amounting to £238,000.* The jewels of the crown were valued at £65,000, and 10 per cent. interest was paid to Rundell and Bridge for the loan of them. Either for the gratification of the monarch or his courtiers, the crown was kept four years, at an annual charge to the public of £6500; and it was only in consequence of a seasonable motion of Mr. Hume the royal bauble was, at last, divested of its borrowed plumage.

We cannot believe it is in contemplation next summer to repeat any thing so monstrously lavish and absurd. William IV. is already in full possession of the throne; he has taken the oaths, as well as all public officers and magistrates, and no additional sanctions are requisite to insure the discharge of their respective functions. A coronation confirms nothing; it affords no stronger guarantee either on the part of the king or the people; it is an unmeaning show, fit only to be exhibited among slaves by an Eastern despot. It is something still more objectionable. Formerly it might be of use, when it was really what it professed to be—a solemn compact between the king and his lieges; but it has since degenerated into a mere mockery of sacred things, of religious rites, vows, and pledges.

Kingly governments are sinking fast in general estimation, and it will certainly be bad policy to depreciate monarchy lower by obtruding it in its most absurd and revolting forms. Instead of expending a QUARTER OF A MILLION on a senseless spectacle, we would beg, in lieu, to suggest that the commencement of the new reign may be commemorated by the building of a new bridge, the construction of a rail-road, the completion of the Thames-tunnel, or any other undertaking of national utility.

* Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, New Series, vol. ix. p. 1107.

The king is reputed to be a man of a kind disposition and good understanding; if such be the case, he will need no monition from us that this is not a time to waste, unnecessarily, the public resources. All new reigns are popular at the commencement, and it is still premature to decide whether the present is destined to be a blessing or a calamity to the community. As parliament meets in a few days, we shall speedily learn something of his Majesty's or his ministers' real intentions towards us. If the King's Speech evince sympathy with the general distress—a desire to curtail a lavish expenditure—a determination to grant a purer representation—and to adhere strictly to the principle of non-intervention in continental affairs, then we shall think we have entered on a brighter era; but, should the foul machinations of any demon of national misery and discord interfere to defeat these fond anticipations, even then we shall not despair; nor do we think Englishmen will resign themselves with patience to a cruel and unjust domination: at all events they will not be so grievously insensible to the duties they owe to themselves and children as to join with loud acclaim, on the coronation-day—*Long live William IV.!*

TAXES ON NEWSPAPERS, AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE PRESS.

The heavy duty on newspapers, whether considered as a source of revenue, or, in its injurious tendency, to restrict the diffusion of intelligence, is the most objectionable part of our fiscal system. A fourpenny stamp, on an article which sells for sixpence, is a tax of 200 per cent. Some of the weekly papers endeavour to evade this onerous impost, by selling a larger paper at a higher price, which reduces the per centage, the duty not being an *ad valorem* one; but they are subject to the disadvantage of a more limited sale, owing to the high price of their publications.

No one can doubt that a reduction in the duty on newspapers would be more than compensated by an increase in the circulation; but then the object of ministers is not so much to realize revenue as to *control public opinion*. Our limits do not admit of our treating this subject so fully as it deserves; nor is it necessary, after the able exposition it has received from Mr. Owen, the Westminster Review, the Morning Chronicle, and the Scotsman newspapers: we shall, however, submit a few brief observations:—1. On the influence of the high stamp-duties on the state of the newspaper press. 2. On the consequences of restricting the sale of cheap political pamphlets, subjecting them to the same duty as the regular newspapers. Our arguments will be addressed to those who feel an interest in social improvement, not to those who seek only to thrive by abuse and oppression.

The first and most obvious effect of the high duty is, by enhancing the price, to curtail the benefit of newspapers, whether as the source of innocent amusement or useful instruction, to the more opulent classes. But the newspapers depending for support upon what may be termed the proprietary of the country, they will, of course, be conducted on

such principles and in such spirit as is likely to be most agreeable to the interests, the prejudices, and passions of their subscribers. Hence the predominant character of the Press is decidedly ARISTOCRATIC: and it never compromises the favour of its chief patrons by the fearless exposition of any political abuse, superstitious error, commercial or chartered privilege, private vice, or public oppression, in which they are especially interested.

But the Press being under the influence of the opulent, it leaves the indigent, as we shall term them for brevity, without protection. They may be calumniated with impunity, as they often are; their motives, views, and conduct may be distorted, and they have no effective means—no organ—by which they can set themselves right with the community. Hence it is that the great mass of society—the industrious and trading classes—those numerous and useful orders, which constitute the bone and muscle of the social state—are no more represented—their interests are no more maintained, by the daily journals, than they are by the Commons' House of Parliament.

Of late years, a great deal has been said of the advantages of commercial freedom and unrestricted competition; but is a monopoly of knowledge less pregnant with mischief than a monopoly of corn or other article of general consumption? The exclusive privileges of Oxford and Cambridge have been objected to as well as the Bank and East-India Company; but how does it happen there is so little outcry against the Press? The reason is obvious enough: the Press is the *common crier*; but, though loud and prompt in proclaiming the abuses of others, it has been marvellously silent concerning its own. How much the monopoly of the great brewers was reprobated, even by most of the journals; but the public injury, from this source, was limited and unimportant, contrasted with that originating in the monopoly of the Press. No doubt the beverage of the people was diluted and adulterated, but this evil, at the worst, was local in its effects; it was not like the Press, whose despotic authority is not limited to the metropolis, nor the provinces, nor even the empire, but extends to every corner of the globe.

The provincial press takes its tone and character from the London prints; some of the country papers follow in the wake of the *Times*, some the *Morning Chronicle*, some the *Standard*, some the *Globe*, and some other journals; but all have their guide and prototype in the metropolis, from which they cut or copy their opinions. From this sort of paternity and connexion arises a most portentous danger to the liberties and prosperity of the empire. The Press has been designated a *fourth estate*, next in influence and importance to King, Lords, and Commons. But, Great God! only think of what this *fourth estate* consists—twelve daily papers established and carried on solely for gain—whose proprietors are unknown—whose editors are unknown—whose reporters are unknown—in short, belonging and attached to which there is not the slightest thread of responsibility, whatever may be the character and magnitude of their delinquency. Upon this corrupt and intangible pivot one-fourth—aye, a great deal more—of the government

of this great empire depends. What nonsense it is to complain of the Treasury boroughs, of Gatton, or Midhurst, or of rotten boroughs with only a dozen electors, while an overwhelming influence, like this, is tolerated! What dolts ministers would be were they especially to concern themselves about the influence to be derived from these sources, and not avail themselves of the more potent agency which might be derived from the Press. And do we suppose that ministers alone may avail themselves of this power; that great commercial companies, loan-mongers, speculators in the funds, and getters up of bubble companies may not resort to similar aid? Assuredly not; for we know the contrary; we know that the Press has been the great agent not only in the oppressions of the Government but in the fraudulent devices by which one portion of the community has plundered another.

Only place at our disposal, out of the secret service money, £20,000 per annum; a few judgeships and offices in the colonies; a few leases of houses and crown lands in the metropolis; a few livings and dignities in the Church; a few places in the Customs, Excise, and judicial administration; and a few appointments to the magistracy and shrievalties in the country: let us, we repeat, have these things in our gift, and we will engage to make the boasted *fourth estate* of this realm as subservient as the most corrupt and despotic minister could desire. We do not mean to affirm we would render the Press undisguisedly prostituted to the Government: we would further its ends in a much more adroit and effective manner; nor would we go openly with bribe in hand, for, in that case, the sly rogues would bruit our offer, knowing they would gain more by proclaiming it, and boasting of their incorruptible integrity, than accepting our tender: we would not adopt any such vulgar mode of procedure; nevertheless, we would accomplish our employer's purpose. If the premier wished to interfere with France, or Belgium, or to get up a war of any sort, we would render the undertaking popular to his heart's content; if he wished to set his face against the reform of domestic abuses, we would convince ninety-nine out of every hundred that our institutions had stood the test of ages, and are the best the wit of man ever devised; if he wished to hunt down a troublesome individual, we would render the caitiff an exile from all decent and respectable society; if he wished to destroy all public spirit in the people, we would throw such discredit on every meeting and association for a patriotic object, that the parties thereto should appear nothing better than gaping idiots, or poverty-stricken knaves, whose sole purpose was the plunder of the RICH!

All this we would do, and more, and the great beauty of our doings would be that they should be so dexterously managed that they would neither bring scandal on ourselves, our employer, nor the agents of our *diabolism*. The only machinery necessary to put in motion would be simply a well-directed MENSONGE, with which gentlemen connected with the "respectable part of the Press" are well acquainted. It would consist of an artful and incessant grinding of paragraphs—an amplifying and improving, or, if an opponent, a garbling, curtailing,

and suppressing of speeches—the omission, misrepresentation, or blazoning, as the case might be, of all public meetings and proceedings—in short, in picturing every thing and person on the *broad sheet* in such a way that they should be viewed through a multiplying glass, or the right or wrong end of the telescope, as might best suit the purpose of the “*Captain*,” or whoever else might be his successor in office.

All this we should be able to effect without fear of detection or exposure: we would manage the press with less noise than Mr. Holmes manages our immaculate representatives; the close monopoly affords every facility for bribery and concealment; and through these diverging rays of intelligence—the country papers would partake, equally with the rest, of the impulse given at the primal source; they would be as unconscious of the presence, as unparticipant in the favours of the great operator at the focal point.

Perhaps our almost allegorical description of the relation in which the journals stand to the community may not be fully comprehended by all our readers; but it would be a more invidious task than we should like, to illustrate our subject by practical examples. What we have said applies to the Press in its corporate and irresponsible capacity; of the individuals connected with it, they are, we believe, as estimable as any other class; and some there are, we know, animated by an almost enthusiastic devotion to popular rights and social happiness. It is not their fault exactly that they are placed in a *false position*, in respect of society; that from the operation of the stamp duty, excluding competition, they have been raised into great and hazardous undertakings, which renders it almost madness, and something like breach of trust to the proprietors, to indulge their private sentiments at the risk of compromising the partial interests on which the prosperity of the journals confided to their management notoriously depends.

This is the most that can be said in extenuation of their timid, see-saw, compromising, and vacillating conduct; and after all, it does not lessen the magnitude of the evil under which the public suffers. That this evil exists, and to a portentous extent, we shall establish, from the present state and management of *The Times*. This journal exercises an irresponsible power, dangerous to the interests of society; and were this power exercised in opposition to the government—which, by the by, it never will, at least to its fundamental corruptions—it would be dangerous even to the government. Had we the option, whether, as an instrument of the general happiness, we would prefer the return of 100 honest members to parliament from the unrepresented towns, or we would have the Times at our beck, we should unhesitatingly say, give us the beldame of Printing-house-square, with her good name, her Medusean front, her quiver of poisoned arrows, her subtlety, literary tact, and experience in all the springs of life and action. The influence she is enabled to exercise over public opinion is incredible, and can only be appreciated by those habituated to observe social movements, and the agency by which they are produced.

It is because a newspaper has such power, which may be directed to a beneficial or malignant purpose, that we consider the state of the Press objectionable. It accords with the general tactics of the Times, after due deliberation—for they seldom leap before they look—to take a decided part on every public question of importance, and to make that part, no matter by what means, triumphant. Lately, the Times, under the operation of some influence—perhaps, an indirect intimation of the wishes of the ministers—took a most extraordinary course in respect of the affairs of the Netherlands. We have no doubt that the numerous readers of this journal—and many of them resort to no other medium of information from which to form an opinion—consider themselves well informed of the causes which originated the Belgian revolt, and of the conduct of the Dutch. We can assure all such they are most egregiously mistaken; that they are completely in the dark relative to Belgian affairs; and that the Times, by a system of suppressing intelligence, distorting facts, and all those arts of MENSONGE, to which we have before alluded, have completely misled them, in regard to the real merits of the transactions in the Low Countries. A similar disingenuous course is adopted by this print, in treating other public questions; an *ex-parte* colouring and mis-representation is given; and the Times, which boasts of Rhadamanthean justice in all its dealings, is as remote from it as the poles asunder.

In one respect the pecuniary interests of this paper interferes with its claims to patronage as a vehicle of general intelligence. It is not so much a newspaper, as a print devoted to the attainment of limited objects; money is one, and the furthering certain political interests, another; and in order more effectually to accomplish these, matters of interest to the general reader are often excluded from its columns. It can by no means assume to be a *mirror of the age*; it is too much of a partizan, and conducted on principles too exclusive for that: articles of intelligence, facts, speeches, public proceedings, correspondence, and other matters are often omitted, either to make room for advertisements and other profitable insertions, or because they are inconsistent with the line of politics to which it is pledged; and it thus often happens, the reader, who exclusively relies upon it for information, is surprised by the occurrence of events of which he had no previous intimation. Who, for example, could have anticipated the repulse of the cowardly Dutch from Brussels, after relying on the statements of the Times, that the disturbances in the Netherlands were merely the movements of the rabble, instead of a national insurrection, originating in long-suppressed grievances. It is the same in other things; the Times completely hoodwink their readers, or, at least, only suffer them to have as much light as is compatible with their own varying interests and purposes. Our opinion is, that this journal must ultimately decline, from the mere excess of its popularity; those who wish to be accurately informed of public affairs, can have no desire that important intelligence should be suppressed or distorted, from party or interested

motives, nor can it be for the advantage of mere commercial advertisers to send their favours to be printed on a supplementary sheet, which is seldom read, and only considered waste paper, to be cast aside.

Irresponsible, and occasionally oppressive power, exercised by the Times, and the defects in its management as a public journal, fully, in our opinion, exemplify the abuses which may grow up under the present system of the Press. For the correction of these evils we know nothing so appropriate as *opening the trade*, by means of minor publications. The suppression of the cheap political pamphlets by lord Castlereagh always appeared to us both unjust and impolitic. Sedition and licentiousness might have been effectually restrained without destroying an instrument which, ultimately, might have been made subservient to the attainment of the most salutary ameliorations. It is the imposition of the *stamp duty*, not the demand of security of which we complain; the former completely interdicting, to a vast majority of the community, a source of amusement and intellectual improvement.

Some of the most dangerous popular errors, we are convinced, were eradicated solely by the agency of the cheap political tracts. Among these we reckon the prevailing opinions on *Catholic Emancipation*. Before the establishment of the weekly pamphlets the mass of the population was decidedly anti-catholic, and hardly less obstinate in their prejudices than Lord Eldon or Sir C. Wetherall. A prodigious change was effected in the character of the people in another respect. During a scarcity, or high prices, the rage of the labouring classes was mostly vented on the butcher, baker, and farmer; such senseless outrages are now never heard of.

Besides the diffusion of political knowledge and the principles of religious toleration, other advantages, tending to the security of property and the commercial prosperity of the country, resulted from the circulation of cheap pamphlets. We allude to the introduction of *machinery*. This, for obvious reasons, was opposed by the mass of the people. It was impossible they should at first be reconciled to inventions which, though tending to the general advantage, by the multiplication of commodities at a cheaper rate, yet, if they did not deprive some classes of the means of subsistence, degraded them for ever into lower stations. It was natural, therefore, they should resist this innovation; and, in so doing, we believe, they did no more than the legal, ecclesiastical, or any other class would have done, had their interests been sacrificed, though that sacrifice were made for the general good. It was necessary, however, the principle should triumph. The people resisted; severer laws were made against frame-breakers, and a terrible sacrifice was made at York: but all this would have been ineffectual, had not another cause interfered. This cause, we verily believe, was the introduction of the *two-penny trash*; which demonstrated that, however injurious the employment of machinery might be to particular branches of industry, yet, inasmuch as it augmented the supply of food and clothing, consequently rendered them cheaper to all classes,

it must be ultimately beneficial. Here, then, was another advantage resulting from pamphlet-writing.

One more remark may be made on this subject. It was unceasingly represented, at the time, that the weekly writers were solely occupied on those subjects most likely to *inflame* and *delude* their readers: had this been their only object, it is strange they did not more frequently allude to the subject of *machinery*. Here, indeed, was a fine field both for inflaming and deluding the people. Thousands of unhappy men might have been found in the manufacturing districts, whose passions it were easy to inflame, and whose vengeance it were easy to direct to the destruction of machinery, as the cause of their sufferings. But among the cloud of publications issuing from the press, not one contained the least allusion to this popular topic of discontent: among all the *incendiary*, *inflammatory*, and *designing* writers, as they were called, there was not one base enough, whose love of mischief, whose desire to avail himself of distress, to inflame the discontents of the people were such as to induce him to resort to the expedient of representing machinery as the cause of, or its destruction the means whereby their sufferings might be alleviated. We are convinced, if pamphlet-writing had been in as full activity this winter as it was ten years ago, the county of Kent would not have been the scene of outrages directed against the machinery and property of individuals who suffer as much as the unfortunate peasantry from the burthens and oppressions of the Borough System.

Much has been said about the pernicious, dangerous, and absurd doctrines which were propagated. Possibly, this might be the case; possibly, with many important truths, error also might be inculcated; possibly, ideas beneficial to society might be accompanied with others of a contrary tendency. This, however, was matter of opinion; and a more proper subject for discussion than coercion. Admitting that cheap publications were injurious as well as beneficial, it afforded no argument whatever for their suppression. The same objection might be made to plays, novels, romances, and almost every other publication; the same objection might be urged against the amusements of the theatre: all these, no doubt, are productive of evil as well as good to the community; but who ever, on that account, thought that they should be suppressed? Who ever expects to see any thing which is not accompanied with some portion of evil? The only principle in this, as in every other case, is to balance the good against the evil; and it was on this principle the fate of the cheap publications ought to have been determined.

It is unnecessary, we think, to say any thing more in defence of political pamphlets. We were desirous of submitting a few observations at present, because it appears likely an attempt will be made to revive them; and, contemporary with that, probably an attempt to stop their circulation. We were also anxious to undeceive many well-meaning persons, whose fears were artfully excited on a former occasion, and

who were taught to look upon this portion of the press as an unmixed source of disorder and immorality. Important advantages, however, it is clear, resulted from its labours; not merely were many valuable truths in political economy disseminated, and the prejudices of bigotry and intolerance rooted out, but property secured, and a prodigious change wrought in the moral and intellectual character of the people. On the revilers and slanderers of the Reformers, we are aware, these arguments will make little impression; we shall have rather excited their fears than conciliated their esteem: their security is in the slavery and ignorance of the population; and they look to the diffusion of the principles of liberty and knowledge through the great mass of society with the same horror the wicked await the day of judgment and retribution.

These calumniators represent the present struggle as one betwixt *property* and *no-property*; whereas, it is a struggle betwixt that importance the people are acquiring, and which they ought to acquire, and the unprincipled usurpations of their rulers. The people have become much too enlightened for the present system. They have discovered its abuses, defects, and injustice. Their resistance to the Oligarchy is not a feverish excitement; it is not a transitory burst of enthusiasm, resulting from some brutal outrage of arbitrary power, but a permanent feeling, originating in a deliberate investigation of the causes of their privations. Such being the nature of the present discontents, they are not likely to subside. Time will rather increase than abate their force. To attempt to stifle them is chimerical. Coercion, while it irritates and prejudices men against its authors, invariably strengthens and confirms them in their opinions. Ministers may narrow the channel of information; but they cannot recall that stream of light which has been shed into every village, hamlet, and workshop of the kingdom. The people have little more to learn in respect of the present government. There is now scarcely an individual any way connected with its abuses whose name is not familiarly known in every part of the country. No factious juggle; no pretended zeal for religion, social order, and the security of property can now deceive. All the different classes—legal or ecclesiastical, their motives, interests, and hypocritical professions, have been fully exposed. But this is not all: the people are not only acquainted with the vices of the system, but also the most safe and effectual remedies. Formerly, they were the victims of spies and informers; they were deluded into abortive attempts against a system too strong in its corruptions, in the fears of some and the venality of others, to be pulled down by open disorganized violence; but caution, perseverance, and indestructible hatred to boroughmongering, an unceasing hostility to every thing tending to its support, are now the maxims of reformers.

Reform may be delayed for a time by the apathy of the middling classes. Something may be said in extenuation of the backwardness of this part of the community. Many of them, in a great measure, have acquired their wealth and importance under what is denominated the Pitt System; and they look to that system, with a

sort of filial gratitude, as the author of their being. But it is an egregious error to suppose that they are indebted for their wealth and advantages to the policy of Mr. Pitt. To that minister England owes nothing but her wars, her debt, her taxes, and poor-rates. These were the distinguishing features of his system; and they cannot be considered conducive to commercial prosperity. In fact, it is to the people, not to the government,—it is to the discoveries of Watt, Arkwright, and Wedgwood, that the merchants and manufacturers are indebted for their wealth; and that they have been enabled, in spite of stamp-duties, excises, taxes, and imposts, to maintain an ascendancy in every market of the world.

To Church and State the people owe little but their calamities. Even for their religious and moral character they are indebted solely to themselves. Certainly it is not to the formularies, the ostentation, and the principles of the ecclesiastical establishment, that they would look for either the forms or precepts of Christianity; and as little would they expect to find examples of morality in the licentious lives of non-resident incumbents, or in the bribery, drunkenness, and perjury of our representative system.

We shall now conclude our observations on the newspaper stamp-duties and the efforts of the Aristocracy to stop reform by the Vandal expedient of taxing knowledge. All their endeavours will prove abortive. They might as well try to shut out the light of the sun as to prevent the diffusion of intelligence. Will they not learn even from experience? Did not the *Holy Alliance*, in the plenitude of their prosperity, adopt every precaution which short-sighted tyranny could suggest to prevent the spread of liberal ideas; and how well they succeeded is not the present state of France, of Belgium, Germany, and Italy a triumphant answer? But the futility of the attempt does not lessen its turpitude. It may be likened to the endeavour of the Catholic priests to interdict from their followers the reading of the Scriptures in a language they understood. These religionists, like the boroughmongers in respect to political information, affected to be apprehensive the Sacred Volume would be misunderstood or misapplied, unless its contents were passed through the crucible of accredited agents. But the real motive, as every one knows, was the fear their craft would be exposed; they knew their emoluments, their influence, and the veneration in which they were held depended on popular ignorance. But the truth was at length discovered, and then followed a terrible reformation; which is exactly the result we should anticipate from similar exertions on the part of our political monks. Efforts to prevent the exposition of abuses would do more to confirm men in a belief of their existence, and the unprincipled nature of the system, than could be done by cheap publications in a century; and they admit their criminality in shrinking from investigation.

Knowledge is the great instrument by which the rights of the people are to be acquired; and, of course, it is against this powerful engine all the efforts of tyranny are directed. The chief objects sought to be

attained in legislating against the Press are, to enfeeble the spirit of public discussion, and narrow the circle of political information, by the joint operation of fear and vexatious restrictions. According to the laws now in force, every printer is compelled to print his name and place of abode at the bottom of every thing he prints; he is compelled to keep a copy, in order to its being produced, if called for, to the secretary of state; the printers and proprietors of a newspaper, or political periodical, are compelled to go to the stamp-office, and swear that they are so; they are obliged also to make oath to their several places of abode; and the publisher is obliged to deposit one copy of every number of the paper in the stamp-office, where it is ready to be produced against all the parties, in case of any prosecution for a libel.

To these impediments, in the way of political publications, may be added, the arbitrary and tyrannical powers of the attorney-general. This officer can, at any time, file an information; he can bring a man to trial, or put the trial off, and may thus keep a prosecution hanging over a man for an indefinite period. When a man is brought into court, he can stop the proceedings, or go on with them. If two men are prosecuted and convicted for the same thing, he may bring one up for punishment, and suffer the other to escape without any punishment at all. In 1809, Sir Vicary Gibbs introduced the dangerous practice of holding to bail, or sending to prison in default of bail, immediately an ex-officio information is filed; and this may be done without bringing, or having any intention to bring, the party to trial.

Supposing our legislators ever so successful in an attempt to fetter the Press, what advantages would they derive from it? Would it ensure prosperity to commerce and manufactures? Would it reduce the debt or the poor-rates? Would it relieve the distress of the rural population, or fill the coffers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer? Unless it would accomplish some of these, it would do nothing. *It would not stop the progress of reform.* That cause must and will triumph. The truths disseminated cannot be rooted out by the hand of power. It is not now a problematical, but a demonstrated truth that the calamities of the country flow from overwhelming taxation, originating in non-representation; that they are the effect of a shameless waste of the public money, participated in and supported by a corrupt House of Commons. This is the conviction of at least nine-tenths of the community; and it cannot be destroyed by gagging-bills.

EAST-INDIA COMPANY.

AMONG the various monopolies and privileged communities which impede individual enterprise and national prosperity, the East-India Company and the Bank of England stand pre-eminent: these form the out-works, the strong holds, of the borough system; and, by their various connexions and interests, add greatly to that mass of influence by which the latter is supported. Both these powerful associations have become more like petty states, acknowledging a feudatory dependence on the sovereign chief, than companies of traders, originally incorporated for commercial purposes. Both have risen from very humble beginnings, and perhaps it would not be easy to strike the balance of turpitude by which their power has been respectively acquired. Both have been nurtured under the fostering care of the Oligarchy, to which, under particular emergencies, they have been indebted for assistance; and, probably, it is from a knowledge of this obligation, that these chartered bodies feel such a lively interest in the safety of the state, and that whenever any popular movement indicates proceedings hostile to the government, they are instantly alarmed, and the Bank and the India-House immediately placed in an attitude of defence.

Both the Bank and the East-India Company claim particular attention, from the period having arrived about which their charters expire; and the legislature will shortly have to determine their future immunities, and the relative position in which they are to stand to the government and the community.

Before entering on the exposition of the present state of the East-India Company, it will be proper to give a brief outline of the history of this powerful association, and briefly indicate those extraordinary events by which a few traders in mace, nutmegs, and ginger, have been able to extend their sway over 120 millions of inhabitants, whose happiness depends on their wisdom and justice. In giving this notice, we shall enter into no detail of Asiatic triumphs, of battles and sieges. We have little taste for these things at best, but still less when the

combatants are unequally matched,—when we should have to present a counterpart to the conquest of Peru and Mexico by the Spaniards,—exhibit the conflicts of wolves and sheep, and show how a handful of crafty, hardy, and unprincipled Europeans wrested a mighty empire from the feeble grasp of the artless and effeminate Hindoos. Leaving out, therefore, with one or two exceptions, all military details, which in justice ought never to have formed a part of the history of the East-India Company, we shall confine ourselves principally to the civil transactions of this association.

The first attention to the India trade appears to have been attracted by the success of the Dutch merchants. These rapacious traders, having supplanted the Portuguese, in that part of the world, had an entire monopoly of the trade, and availing themselves of the exclusive possession of the market, exacted exorbitant prices for the productions of the East. To frustrate their avarice, and obtain some share in this lucrative traffic, the merchants of London despatched a mission to the Great Mogul, to obtain from him a grant of commercial privileges to the English. The success of this mission was not known till the year 1600; but, in the mean time, the lord mayor, aldermen, and other principal merchants of the city, to the number of 101, assembled at Founders' Hall, and established an association for trading to India, for which they subscribed a capital of £33,133. This may be considered the germ of our Indian empire.

Queen Elizabeth granted a charter of incorporation to several merchants of the city, with the privilege to trade, exclusively, to all parts of Asia, Africa, and America, for 15 years. The capital of this company amounted to about £70,000. They fitted out four ships, the best in England, of the burthen of 240, 260, 300, and 600 tons. The value of the ships' stores and provisions, of the merchandize forming the cargoes, and of the bullion, was estimated at £68,373.

This expedition was tolerably successful, brought home valuable cargoes of merchandize, and succeeded in establishing factories at Bantany, and on the Molucca Islands. But, notwithstanding the success of this undertaking, no great effort was made to follow it up, and for several years after, the trade and capital of the Company gradually declined. In 1606, only three ships were fitted out. In 1608, the Company having subscribed a capital of £33,000, for a fourth voyage, the whole of their ships were either wrecked in India, or on their voyage home. Next year they were more fortunate, and their ships bringing home a valuable cargo of mace and nutmegs, they divided a profit of 211 per cent. Encouraged by this success, the Company solicited the renewal of their charter, and seemed resolved to push the trade with spirit. They built the largest ship that had ever been constructed in England for commercial purposes, being no less than 1000 tons burthen. King James and his court attended the launch, and named her *The Trade's Increase*.

Unfortunately, this vessel was lost, and Sir Henry Middleton, her commander, soon after died of grief. The trade subsequently declined,

for which various causes may be assigned. The rivals of the Company, the Dutch and Portuguese, made use of every expedient their malice and treachery could suggest, to impede their success; besides which, we may add, the erroneous principles on which the different voyages were undertaken. Instead of the trade being conducted upon a joint-stock, on account of the whole Company, every individual was privileged by the charter, to subscribe as much or as little as he pleased, or nothing at all, for every voyage. The inconvenience and absurdity of this principle had become obvious; and, in 1613, it was determined to have no more separate voyages, but to open a subscription for a joint capital, to continue for four years. Under this system the affairs of the company assumed a new aspect; and in a very short time they had established more than twenty factories, in different parts of the Mogul's dominions, and the islands in the Indian seas.

In 1616, when they proposed to raise a new capital, all ranks crowded into the subscription, which, at the time of closing it, amounted to £1,629,040, being the largest capital that had ever been subscribed in any part of Europe, for a joint-stock trade. Among the subscribers were 15 dukes and earls, 13 countesses, 82 knights, including judges and privy counsellors, 18 widows and maiden ladies, besides clergymen, physicians, merchants, tradesmen, and others without any denomination; in the whole 954 subscribers. The stock of the Company sold for 203 per cent. The total value of their property, at this time, was estimated at £400,000. And it was stated by the deputy-governor, that they gave employment to 10,000 tons of shipping, 2500 seamen, 500 ship carpenters, and 120 factors in India.

In 1669 the Company received two canisters containing 143½ pounds of tea, which is supposed to have been the first importation of this article from any part of the Indies. It was partly given away in presents, and partly consumed in the India-House for the refreshment of the committees.

In 1676, the trade of the Company having been very successful for many years, they were enabled, out of their accumulated profits, to double their capital to £739,782, upon which the market price of their stock, which had been under par, immediately rose to £245 per cent. The ships in their employ amounted to from 30 to 35, of from 300 to 600 tons, and carrying from 40 to 70 guns. In the year 1680, the company sent a ship to trade with China. The whole of that trade had heretofore been monopolized by the Dutch and Portuguese. About this time they acquired the privilege to coin money, not resembling British money, at Bombay and other places in India. The Company consisted of 600 members, who were entitled to votes in proportion to their shares; hence it happened that some had to the amount of sixty votes:—every member, moreover, had liberty to carry on trade on his own private account, to the extent of one-fifth of his stock in the Company's capital.

In 1698, the English factory obtained permission to purchase three small villages, extending in all about three miles along the east bank of

the Ganges, and about one mile back from it, for which they agreed to pay annually to the Nabob 1195 rupees. This paltry acquisition was the commencement of the territorial aggrandizement of the Company, by which they were afterwards enabled, assisted by fraud and force, to extend themselves over the whole Mogul empire. The ground on which these villages stood forms the site of the great city of Calcutta, containing 600,000 inhabitants.

Some jealousy, about this time, began to be entertained at the increasing power of the Company; and the Government intimated to the association, that a large sum would be expected for the public service, in consideration of a parliamentary confirmation of their privileges. They offered to advance £700,000 at an interest of 4 per cent. provided their charter were fully confirmed by parliament. Meanwhile several opulent individuals offered to advance £2,000,000, provided they were invested with all the privileges of the India trade, as heretofore enjoyed by the Company. Parliament accepted the larger sum, though at double interest, and a bill was ordered to be prepared for incorporating the subscribers. The Company, not to be outdone by their opponents, then proposed a loan of £2,000,000, but this availed them nothing. The government was favourable to the opposing interest, and they prevailed. So great were the advantages anticipated by the nation from the new association, that the subscription of two millions was filled up within a few days after the books were opened. The greatest part of this sum was subscribed by foreigners. The king himself was an adventurer to the extent of £10,000.

The charter of the original Company had not yet expired, and a most ruinous contest ensued betwixt the rival associations. More than sixty ships are said to have been employed by the contending interests in the India trade. The glut of India goods, joined to other causes, produced by this rivalry, reduced the value of the stock of the old Company, which had been as high as 500 per cent., to 39 per cent. Both parties at length seem to have discovered the ruinous tendency of this contest, and an union was effected in 1702, by a tripartite indenture, wherein Queen Ann, the old Company, and the new Company were partners. According to this instrument, the two Companies bind themselves to have at least one-tenth of their exports in English manufactures, and after the expiration of seven years they are to be called "*The United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies,*" which is their present designation.

In 1766, the Company, in consequence of their territorial acquisitions, raised their dividends from 6 to 10 per cent. and shortly after to 12½ per cent. In 1779, the time for the renewal of the charter approaching, the company prudently prepared for that event, by a present to the public of three seventy-four gun ships, besides a large sum of money in bounties to 6000 seamen. Notwithstanding this bonus, in 1780 notice was given to the Company, by Government, that, on the expiration of their charter, their exclusive privileges should cease, unless they would agree to pay £1,000,000 into the exchequer, restrict their future divi-

dend to 8 per cent. and pay three-fourths of the surplus profits, over and above that dividend, into the exchequer. After much discussion, the demand for the renewal of their charter was reduced to £600,000. This renewal was to continue till the 1st day of March, 1791, when, on the payment of the debt due by Government to the Company, their exclusive privileges should expire.

The affairs of the East-India Company, and the transactions in Hindustan, began deeply to interest the public, and every session of parliament produced some new investigation on this important subject. From merchants, the company had risen into sovereign princes, and, instead of being occupied with the ginger and pepper trade, they were wholly absorbed in schemes of territorial aggrandisement. Occupied unceasingly in war—buying and exchanging territory—making treaties of partition—hiring troops to the native princes—establishing monopolies—and fomenting hostilities among the nabobs and subahdars, that these short-sighted princes, after weakening each other by their mutual animosities, might fall an easy prey to the superior policy of the common invader. These avocations ill comported with the commercial character, and it was a little inconceivable how men, whose knowledge, it may be supposed, was principally confined to making out invoices, bills of lading, or book-keeping by double entry, could discharge these royal functions.

In 1783, Mr. Fox introduced his famous India Bills, the general objects of which were to divest the company of their administrative functions—to prohibit them from making war, unless in self-defence—from making treaties of partition—hiring troops to the native princes—and every illegal present was to be recoverable by any person for his own benefit. These provisions sufficiently indicate the prevalent abuses. They were opposed by Mr. Pitt, then out of place, an oppositionist and reformer. The question agitated the whole nation; and such was the outcry raised by the company against the pretended violation of their charter—representing such a precedent as endangering the security of all the corporations in the kingdom,—that they finally prevailed, and the bills, though passed in the Commons, were rejected by the Lords.

Next year a dissolution of parliament and change of ministers having taken place, Mr. Pitt introduced a new bill for the better government of India. Many of the provisions of this bill were similar to those of Mr. Fox's. The most important difference related to the appointment of the Board of Control. The commercial affairs and territorial possessions of the Company, were to continue in their hands, subject to the superintendence of a board of commissioners appointed by the Crown.

The next subject of any interest is the trial of Warren Hastings. This gentleman had presided over India thirteen years, and arrived in England on the 16th of June, 1785. On the 26th of the same month, Mr. Burke, who had brought heavy accusations against him in the preceding session, gave notice of his intention to impeach him for high crimes and misdemeanours, alleged to have been committed in India. After long debates in this and succeeding sessions, the prosecution was

sanctioned by the Commons, and, in 1787, articles of impeachment were sent to the Lords. The trial was protracted from year to year, till 23d of April, 1795, when the accused was acquitted, on the payment of his fees, of all the charges preferred against him. The Company, in consideration of the services of this officer, discharged the expenses he had incurred by the prosecution, amounting to upwards of £70,000, and settled upon him an annuity of £5000.

In 1793 the charter of the Company was renewed, and their exclusive privileges continued to them until the first day of March, 1814. In this act a clause was inserted to restrain the belligerent propensities of the Company's servants, but it appears not to have been much regarded. In 1792 Tippoo Saib was despoiled of half his dominions, and compelled to deliver two of his sons into the hands of the Marquis Cornwallis, as hostages for the performance of a treaty by which he engaged to pay £1,600,000 in money to the Company. In 1799 this prince was again attacked by Lord Mornington, now Marquis Wellesley, under pretext of having entered into negotiations with the French, and some of the native princes, for the entire expulsion of the English from India. This war completed the destruction of the sultan. His capital of Seringapatam was taken by assault, himself slain in its defence, and his dominions dismembered. His descendants are now supported by pensions payable by the *ci-devant* dealers in mace and cloves.

The Company having obtained possession of the different members of the Mogul empire, in 1803, completed their conquests by attacking the Mogul himself in his capital of Delhi. This monarch and his family were also placed upon the pension-list of the Company.

We shall only mention a few more facts connected with the Company's history till the opening of the trade in 1814. By the 29 Geo. III. c. 65, they were authorised to add one million to their capital stock. The new stock being subscribed at 174 per cent. produced £1,740,000, which raised their joint-stock to five millions. In 1793, they were authorized to add another million to their capital by subscription, making it £6,000,000, its present amount. This additional stock produced £2,000,000, being subscribed at 200 per cent.

In 1797, valuable concessions were made to the Americans, with regard to the India trade. They were permitted to carry on trade with the Company's territories in India, in articles not prohibited by law, on paying only the duties paid by British vessels. These advantages were not neglected by the Americans. In a few years the trade of the United States in India equalled nearly one-half the trade of the Company. It was singular policy to admit a foreign state to the participation of the India trade while our own merchants were excluded.

In 1803, during the alarm of an invasion, the Company, at a general court, came to a resolution to present to government 10,000 tons of shipping to guard the coast, and to be maintained at their own expense. In the years 1808 and 1809, the Company lost four outward-bound and six homeward-bound ships. The value of the ships and cargoes was estimated at two millions.

We have now mentioned the most important facts in the history of the East-India Company till the year 1813, when the exclusive privileges of this association were in part abolished. Prior to that time, private traders were not wholly excluded from the India trade. By the 17th clause of the act of 1793, the Company were obliged to appropriate 3000 tons of shipping for carrying out goods belonging to private merchants and manufacturers. The act of 1813 continues to the Company the revenue and territorial acquisitions in India, and the exclusive monopoly of the China trade; but the trade to India, subject to certain restrictions and regulations, is thrown open to the enterprise of individuals. These immunities were conceded to the Company until 10th of April, 1831, absolutely, and afterwards, until three years' notice be given by parliament, and the debt due from the public to the Company be paid.

TERRITORIAL ACQUISITIONS AND INDIAN WARS.

No external dominion in the East can endanger the security of the Anglo-Indian empire. All the native princes have either been absolutely conquered, reduced to a state of dependence, or have been so completely humiliated and divested of offensive power, as to render entirely hopeless every chance of successful opposition to the British government. In 1815, the Ghorkas, who possess the kingdom of Nepaul on the northern frontier of Hindustan, made a show of contesting the sovereignty of the Company, but they were completely defeated by lord Hastings, and compelled to purchase peace by the cession of a large tract of territory. The Burmese were the last nation who gave us any uneasiness. They have been represented as a warlike people, and at one time meditated nothing less than an eruption into the province of Bengal. Rangoon, their capital, was occupied by a British force; and, in 1826, after a teasing warfare, they submitted to the terms imposed by the invading army, by which the Company has become possessed of the provinces of Arracan and Tenasserim, including nearly the whole line of coast which previously belonged to the Burman empire.

Of the Mahratta chiefs, Scindia alone retains the full military as well as civil government of his territory. The courts of Holkar, of the Guicowar; rajah of Berar and of the smaller principalities exercise the civil functions of royalty, but are not tolerated in the possession of an armed force. They have each, by the cession or conquest of a part of their territories, purchased military protection from the Company. The Rajpoot chiefs, who occupy the north-west frontier of Hindustan, are tributary either to the Company or to the states of Scindia and Holkar. Of the Mahometan governments, the king of Oude, the Nizam, the rajahs of Mysore and Travancore, and the nabob of Bhopaul, are the principal states whose civil independence is recognized, and these are in such a defenceless condition as to be entirely dependent on the forbearance of the Company for the continuance of their sovereignty.

From foreign rivalry and interference the English have no cause of apprehension. The only colonies which now belong to other European

nations are Pondicherry and Chandernagore, to the French; Goa, to Portugal; Tranquebar and Serampore, to the Danish government; and Chinsurah, to the Dutch.

The population of the territories directly subject to Great Britain has been estimated at 80,000,000 of souls; while the population of those states which enjoy civil independence, but have been deprived of a military force, has been computed to amount to 40,000,000. The territory extends over an area of 585,000 square miles; and the total territory dependent, directly or indirectly, upon the Company, amounts to about 1,180,000 square miles. Such is the mighty empire, for the government and interests of which parliament will be shortly called upon to legislate.

We have not yet adverted to the means by which this vast dominion has been acquired. In our narrative of the commercial progress of the Company, we forbore to enter into the black page of Indian wars and politics. Unparalleled crimes, violated treaties, blood, treachery, and devastation, form the chief materials of Indian history:—crimes, abhorrent even to a nation of barbarians, disgraceful to a civilized state, and horrible when perpetrated by the agents of a Christian country. There was not a single state, we are assured by Burke, prince, or potentate, with whom the Company had come in contact, that they had not sold; not a single treaty they had ever made, that they had not broken; not a single prince or state, who ever put any trust in the Company, who was not utterly ruined; and that none were, in any degree, secure or flourishing, but in the exact proportion to their settled distrust and irreconcilable enmity to this nation.

Indian delinquency is of no grovelling kind, it soars far above all precedent of ancient or European turpitude. Faith, justice, and humanity, were mere pretexts for rapine and violence. When these would not serve for the spoliation of the native powers, imaginary crimes were laid to their charge. Plots and rebellion, which, in England, have often been the pretexts for destroying the liberties of the people, in India were the pretexts for plunder and devastation. These, when no other offered, were the standing resources of the Company. When money had been thought to be heaped up any where, its owners were invariably accused of treason, and the only security for their allegiance was sought in reducing them to indigence. In England poverty is considered the sign of a traitorous disposition, in India it was riches; and the native prince had no chance of living free from the endless accusations and exactions of his oppressors, till he had stripped himself of the sordid wealth which excited their cupidity.

The most profitable merchandize of the Company was the nabobs and soubahdars. These princes, the rightful sovereigns of Hindustan, were sold and resold like *cattle in a fair*; even the Great Mogul himself, the descendant of Tamerlane, was included in the general traffic. This potentate, venerable for his years, and accomplished in all the oriental literature, was sold to his own minister. He was knocked down for the revenue of two provinces. Some princes were sold to their own

children : the Company, exciting the children to a parricidal war against their parents, put them in possession of their dominions, on condition of hereafter being tributary and dependent on the Company. We could mention several instances of this mode of carrying on the royal slave-trade, but we will pass them by, in order to relate a more sweeping sale of Governor Hastings.

This man was the great salesman of Indian territory. We have seen that all the expenses of his prosecution were paid, and he was rewarded with an annuity of £5000 per annum, for his *faithful services* in India. The province of Bengal, over which he presided, and the territory annexed to it, is larger and more populous than France, and formerly contained a landed interest, composed of a numerous nobility and gentry, of freeholders, lower tenants, religious communities, and public foundations. Under the English administration, these provinces had fallen into great decay, and a strong representation was made of its causes. Mr. Hastings, instead of administering any remedy to the disorders, determined, at one blow, to dispossess all the ancient proprietors. The incredible fact is, he set up the whole landed interest of a kingdom larger than France to public auction. He set up, says Burke, the whole nobility, gentry, and freeholders to the highest bidder.* No preference was given to the zemindars, the ancient proprietors. They were compelled to bid for their own property against every usurer, jobber, speculator, or European servant; or they were obliged to content themselves, in lieu of their extensive domains, with their house and such a pension as the state auctioneer thought fit to assign. Several of them, in lieu of their hereditary lands, contented themselves with a pension, of which, under a new stretch of rapacity, they were subsequently deprived.

For the calamities inflicted on this devoted region, by avarice and ambition, few compensatory advantages have been rendered. Scarcely a single trace is to be found of the superiority of our civil administration; nor a record of usefulness and generosity. Almost every village in England, attests the former sovereignty of the Romans, by the ruins of some work of power or utility; but the future Hindoo will in vain seek for mementos of our sway, in the bridges we have built, the navigations we have opened, or the highways we have constructed. All former conquerors of Hindustan—the Arabs, the Tartars, and the Persians, left behind them some monument of either state or beneficence; but were we to be driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any thing “better than the ourang-outang or the tiger.” Our only principle of government has been a system of IMPOSTURE, and our countrymen have visited India not to benefit the natives, but themselves. Their object is to amass fortunes, and they resort thither in endless flights, like birds of prey and passage. All discussion, all inquiry, all familiar intercourse with the people they prey upon is discouraged, lest

* Works of Edmund Burke, vol. iv. p. 85.

it should betray the secret of our weakness, and the delusion upon which our empire is established.

Our military triumphs have been as void of true glory as our civil administration. The feeble and indolent Hindoos were a very unequal match for the energy, artillery, and tactic combinations of Europeans; the greatest obstacles they could oppose to their invaders were the fatigue of long marches and a destructive climate. To meet them in the field was synonymous with defeat, dispersion, or capture. Hence our most signal victories, in the East, have been little more than so many *battus*—the “slaughter of some hundred deer.”

In the “Life and Correspondence of Sir Thomas Munro,” recently published, we have some striking illustrations of Indian warfare. The Mahrattas were always reckoned among our most formidable opponents, and the battle of Assaye, the most brilliant of the eastern triumphs of the Duke of Wellington. Yet it appears these warriors, in this most memorable conflict, kept so far aloof from close collision with our troops, as to inflict no wound either with bayonet or bullet. Speaking of this battle, in a letter to Colonel Read, Sir T. Munro says, “At the battle of Assaye, the severest that took place in the course of the war, I do not recollect, among all our killed and wounded officers, one that suffered from a *musket-ball* or a *bayonet*, a convincing proof that the Mahratta infantry made very little serious opposition. Its discipline, its arms, and uniform clothing I regard merely as the means of *dressing it out for the sacrifice*.”

In the “Correspondence” are several letters from the Duke of Wellington, then Colonel Wellesley, which throw an instructive light on the reckless, plundering, and destroying system which marked our Indian triumphs. In one letter, Colonel Wellesley recommends, in dashing style, the “*cutting up*” and “*hunting out*” the natives. To be sure these were thieves, and it might be quite in keeping with Indian justice to do execution upon them without trial, judge, or jury.

In another letter, Colonel Wellesley signalizes the exploits of a brother officer, by the following graphic description:—

“Colonel Montresor has been very successful in Bulum; *has beat, burnt, plundered, and destroyed in all parts of the country*. But I am still of opinion that nothing has been done which can tend effectually to put an end to the rebellion in Bulum, and that the near approach of the rains renders it impossible to do THAT, which alone, in my opinion, will ever get the better of Kistnapah Naig.”*

We may recognize, in these military sketches, the same fierce and determined spirit which so promptly turned to the right about the late Mr. Huskisson. Bonaparte was certainly as regardless of human life as any conqueror that ever desolated the face of the earth; but there is one letter of Colonel Wellesley, which, it must be allowed, evinces as

* Supplement to the Life of Major-General Sir T. Munro, vol. iii. p. 120.

much barbarous indifference to the common feelings of humanity as ever Napoleon did in the worst of his Egyptian slaughterings. We shall give the letter entire. The colonel was at the time pursuing his operations against Dhoondee.

“ Camp at Soodnetty, Aug. 1st, 1800.

“ DEAR MUNRO,—I have received your letters of the 22d and 23d ; I have sent orders to the commanding officers at Hullihall and at Nuggar to furnish ammunition, in moderate quantities, on the requisition of your amildars ; in any quantities you please, on your own. Don't press Hullihall too much, as I know they are not very well supplied there. Take what you please from Nuggar. *I have taken and destroyed Doondiah's baggage and six guns, and driven into the Malpurba (where they were drowned) about FIVE THOUSAND PEOPLE: I stormed Dummull on the 26th July.* Doondiah's followers are quitting him apace, as they do not think the amusement very gratifying at the present moment. The war, therefore, is nearly at an end ; and another blow, which I am meditating upon him and his bunjarries, in the Kentoor country, will most probably bring it to a close. I must halt here to-morrow, to refresh a little, having marched every day since the 22d July ; and on the 30th, the day on which I took his baggage, I marched twenty-six miles ; which, let me tell you, is no small affair in this country.

“ My troops are in high health and spirits, and their *pockets full of money, the produce of plunder.* I still think, however, that a store of rice at Hullihall will do us no harm, and, if I should not want it, the expense incurred will not signify.”

The man who could write this deserves that his name should be inscribed on the same roll with Atila and Zinghis Khan. It is only, however, a proof of the brutalizing tendency of war ; for we never heard that Colonel Wellesley had either less or more humanity than the usual run of conquerors. But how horrible to boast of having driven five thousand people into a river, where they were drowned ! Then with what gusto the future Prince of Waterloo talks of *plunder*, and of *burning*, and *destroying*. These excerpts are enough to illustrate Asiatic triumphs.

GOVERNMENT AND PATRONAGE OF INDIA.

The present frame of India government was established under the act of 1784, and modified, by subsequent acts for the renewal of the charter, in 1793 and 1813. Under the authority of these acts, by the institution of the Board of Control, such superintendence of the affairs of India is vested in the ministers of the Crown as precludes misgovernment without their concurrence. The Board is appointed by the King, and consists of twelve commissioners, of whom the two Secretaries of State and the Chancellor of the Exchequer are *ex officio* members ; the president of the Board is the responsible officer, but the assistance of two other members is necessary to render its proceedings valid. The

Board is invested with a control in all matters relating to the government of India, whether civil, military, or financial. It has access to all records, and may require abstracts and statements respecting all affairs not strictly commercial. No despatches relating to government or revenue can be forwarded to India without its approval. It may even originate instructions, and the Court of Directors, though they may remonstrate, cannot alter them. All despatches received from India must be immediately submitted to the Board; nor can any public disclosure of their contents take place, except under its authority. No war can be undertaken in India without its sanction. It may grant licenses to individuals to reside in India, and to ships to trade, when such licenses have been refused by the Directors. So extensive, indeed, have been the powers committed to it, that, whatever may have been the complexion of the Company's measures in India, their responsibility is shared by the Board of Control, and, through it, by the king's ministers at home.*

Subordinate to the Board of Control are the administrative bodies emanating from the Company. The first in responsibility and power is the Court of Directors, consisting of twenty-four members. They are elected by the General Court of Proprietors, who meet four times a-year, and to whom it belongs to declare the dividend; to appoint a committee to frame by-laws, to control all grants above a certain amount; and to receive reports from the Directors respecting the general state of the Company's concerns. No proprietor is entitled to a vote unless he be possessed of £1000 East-India stock; and the qualification for a Director is £2000 stock. Six Directors go out annually in rotation, so that four years is the period of service for each Director; no Director can be re-elected until he has been out of the direction for at least one year; thirteen Directors form a Court, and the presence of that number is necessary to give effect to all orders and instructions which do not emanate from the secret committee. The business of the Company is chiefly conducted by committees and sub-committees, to which are permanently allotted certain defined duties, and which are composed of Directors appointed in the order of their seniority.

In India, the administration of each of the three presidencies of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay is vested in a Governor and Council, consisting of three members. The Commander-in-Chief may be a member of Council, without regard to the term of his residence; but no civil servant of the Company can become member of Council until he has served ten years in India. The Government of Calcutta is supreme over the other governments in matters relating to peace, war, and revenue. All the proceedings of the governments in India must be recorded by minutes, with a statement of the reasons upon which they have been founded, for the purpose of checking mal-administration. The governments are entrusted with the entire control over the army, and with the imposition of taxes, in all the dominions of the Company,

* Considerations relative to the Renewal of the East-India Company's Charter. By William Smith O'Brien, Esq. M.P.

except the towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay; and their regulations have the authority of law, until reversed by instructions from home. The Governor-General is empowered to apprehend all suspected persons, and either to send them home, to be tried in England, or, having forwarded copies of all depositions in their case, to retain them for judgment in India. Except in case of invasion, or of the most urgent necessity, the Governor-General is restrained from declaring war until the sanction of the Directors and of the Board of Control has been received. The commercial and financial concerns of the Company in India are superintended by a Board of Trade and a Board of Revenue. The collection of the revenue is conducted by British collectors, aided by British assistants; but all the inferior business of this department is transacted by natives.

There are three different classes of courts of justice in India. In the first are the King's Courts, or Supreme Courts of Judicature, whose jurisdiction extends to all British-born subjects residing in the provinces, but, in suits between natives, is limited to the immediate vicinity of the presidencies. The courts which administer justice in those cases in which the natives are concerned are of two kinds, civil and criminal. Each kind consists of a supreme court, with courts of circuit and subordinate tribunals, down to institutions analogous to our Courts of Request and petty sessions. In all the courts Europeans preside, except those of the lowest description, in which there are native judges. Justice is administered according to the Mahomedan law, modified by a regard to Hindoo usages and by the regulations of the British Government. The natives have lately been rendered capable of sitting on juries, and it may be hoped that the introduction of this institution will tend to exalt the character of the people, to curb that disposition to pervert justice which is the great political vice of the East, and to supply the deficiencies, under which an European judge must always labour, in weighing the evidence of a people with whose habits and ideas he can be only partially acquainted.

Such is a brief outline of the system under which the Indian empire is administered. Like most constitutions, it sounds well on paper, and does not appear liable to serious objections; but the general government at home is a striking instance how widely the principles of a constitution may differ from its practical administration. It is only an intelligent Hindoo, or some one actually cognizant of our India policy, who could give adequate testimony to the good or evil it confers on the native population. Unfortunately the authorities at Calcutta do not tolerate the publication of an *Extraordinary Black Book* there, nor hardly a Times newspaper, otherwise one might become acquainted with the working of the Leadenhall administration.

One of the best criterions of good government is the excellence of the judicial system. That of India has always been represented corrupt and oppressive. The administration of justice is the most lucrative profession in the east as well as in England. According to a statement of Mr. Hume, in the House of Commons, suitors in India are obliged to pay to government on the sum sued for from 50 to 7 and 6 per cent.

and a fine is levied on all debts sued for, decreasing as the amount increases! Every document requisite to the progress of a suit, the citations, examinations, and depositions of witnesses, are all to be written on stamped paper; thereby increasing the expenses to an enormous total. These expenses amount to a virtual denial of justice, and, in the course of a long life, a man could scarcely expect to see any termination of suits; in a word, it is the English chancery system—that admirable contrivance for spunging clients—operating in India. The police is established on the Sidmouth or Villele system. A corps of spies is attached to every preventive establishment, and there is no *Habeus Corpus Act* to expedite judicial sentences. Persons are frequently taken up, and months elapse before any information is exhibited against them. In the interval they are confined in crowded and unhealthy prisons, where death not unfrequently overtakes them; or, after enduring the aggravated misery of imprisonment, nothing whatever appears against them, and they are liberated. For these blessings the Hindoos pay annually about £1,785,000, which is a greater expense than all the law-officers in Europe.

Leaving for the present any further strictures on the general government of India, let us advert to the important subject of *India influence and patronage*.

The whole patronage of India, civil and military, is vested in the Court of Directors, with the exception of the appointments of bishops, and of the judges of the Supreme Courts of Judicature. The Governors in India and the Commander-in-Chief are named by the Company, but their appointment must be sanctioned by the king. The king also possesses the power of removing any civil servant from his office in India. With these exceptions, the entire civil, naval, and military patronage of India vests in the Company, and exceeds in amount the patronage of the Crown before the French revolutionary war. Of the extent of this patronage we may form some idea from the number of persons in the Company's service. We have no means of stating exactly the number of persons employed by the Company, but the following is an estimate when the revenues and possessions of the east were much less than at present.

Civil Service.	{	Persons either in the service of the Company or connected with and employed in their affairs in England	2,146
		Persons in India employed in the judicial, clerical, diplomatic, commercial, and revenue departments.....	1,056
		Seamen employed and reared in the Company's service in 115 ships, about	25,000
Military and Naval Service.	{	British military officers in the Company's service commanding European troops	1,000
		British officers and cadets in the Company's service commanding native troops	3,000
		British non-commissioned officers and soldiers in the service of the Company	16,000
		British officers in the Company's naval department in India	113

Natives in the service of the Company.	{	Natives employed in various departments in the civil service of the Company	12,362
		Natives employed in the Indian armies.....	140,000
		Natives employed in the naval service estimated at about	800
		Total	201,477

All the salaries in India are on a much more extravagant scale than in England. Of the above 201,477 persons in the service of the Company, at least 6000 in the civil and military departments at home and abroad, enjoy emoluments from £200 to £10,000 a year, exclusive of the Governor-General. The salary of the Governor-General of Bengal is £25,000 a year, and three counsellors with a salary of £10,000 a year each. The salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Calcutta is £8000 a year, with three other judges at £6000 a year each. By the act of 1813, the salary of a bishop in India is £5000 a year, and of three archdeacons £2000 a year each. The expense of outfit, &c. of different officers was fixed by the same act, as follows:—

Governor-General of Fort William, in Bengal	£5000
Each of the members of council there.....	1200
Commander-in-Chief of all the Forces in India	2500
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at Fort William	1500
Each of the Puisne Judges there	1000
Governor of Fort St. George.....	3000
Each of the members of council there.....	1000
Commander-in-Chief there.....	2000
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court there.....	1200
Each of the Puisne Judges there.....	1000
Governor of Bombay	2500
Each of the members of council there	1000
Commander-in-Chief there.....	1500
Recorder there.....	1500
Governor of Prince of Wales's Island.....	1200
Recorder there	1000
Bishop	1200
Each of the Archdeacons	500

The allowance for the outfit, &c. of those officers is about one-fourth the amount of their salaries, exclusive of other emoluments. According to the statement in the *East-India Register*, the allowance per month to general and regimental officers when in the field, on the Bengal establishment, is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
General officer on the staff	662	10	0
Colonel not on the staff.....	156	5	0
Lieutenant-Colonel	123	15	0
Major	93	15	0
Captain	51	7	6
Captain-Lieutenant	43	17	6
Lieutenant	31	15	0
Ensign	25	0	0

Adjutant	28	7	6
Quarter-Master	14	12	6
Surgeon	51	7	6
Assistant ditto	31	15	0

The allowance to officers on the Fort St. George and Bombay Establishments, are nearly the same as the above. The sums granted by way of superannuation allowance to officers and servants of the Company are very considerable. They are fixed according to the following scale, by the 53d Geo. III. c. 155.

	Proportion of salary.
If an officer or servant shall have served with diligence and fidelity in the Company's service for 10 years, and being under 60 years of age, shall be incapable, from infirmity of mind or body, to discharge the duties of office	One-third.
If above 10 years and less than 20	One-half.
If above 20 years	Two-thirds.
If such officer or servant shall be above 60 years of age, and he shall have served 15 years or upwards, without infirmity of mind or body	Two-thirds.
If 65 years of age, or upwards, and he shall have served 40 years or upwards	Three-fourths.
If 65 years of age, and he shall have served 50 years or upwards	The whole.

From the preceding details, some idea may be formed of the immense value of India patronage, and the wide field it opens for providing for children, relatives, and dependents. The trade of the Company has never been an object of so much importance as the military appointments to an army of 150,000 men, the filling up of vacancies in the judicial and police departments, and the numerous situations in the collection and expenditure of a revenue of 24 millions per annum. It is the annual value of these different situations which constitutes the *real profit* of the Company.

It is evident that the excellence of our administration in India will depend upon the employment of individuals recommended by integrity and talent. In theory this principle appears to have been admitted by the Directors in 1793, when, by one of their bye-laws, it was enacted that each Director, ten days after his election, should take oath to receive no emolument, perquisite, or pecuniary gratification, for any appointment in India. Little regard was paid to this obligation, and so early as 1798, it was notorious that a very extensive and systematic traffic was carried on for places in India. Several attempts were made, real or pretended, by Committees of the House of Commons, also by committees appointed by the Court of Directors, to discover the individuals implicated in these practices. On one occasion it was proposed that each Director should take oath he had not received any reward for any appointment he had made; but this was rejected by a large majority, and the sale in offices continued by public advertisement and otherwise,

till at last an office was openly established for the sale and purchase of India patronage.

The practice was shameless and notorious; but it does not appear to have been completely laid bare, till the memorable disclosures in 1809, relative to Mrs. Clarke and the Duke of York. In that year it was discovered that the improper disposal of India patronage had not been confined to the honourable Directors, but extended even to the right honourable President of the Board of Control. The then president was Lord Castlereagh. This minister, by the agency of a common place-broker, attempted to purchase, for a writership in India, a seat in parliament for his friend Lord Clancarty. Here was corruption three deep. It was a dereliction of his duty as a minister of the Crown; a shameless abuse of his trust as President of the Board of Control; and a daring attack on the *purity* (bah, avaunt, Whiggery!) of the Commons' House of Parliament. Such was the description of this transaction by Lord A. Hamilton. Lord Castlereagh, however, was defended, on the ground of the notoriety of the practice. Some of the members said that selling seats in the House of Commons was as *notorious as the sun at noon-day*: this could not be denied, for it is well known that the Secretary of the Treasury is in the constant practice of buying seats for the adherents of ministers. This being the case, there appeared injustice in making an example of the President of the Board of Control; and the motion was got rid of by moving the order of the day.

The fact of Lord Castlereagh having a writership at his disposal to purchase a seat in the House of Commons, shows how ministers may avail themselves of even subordinate appointments in India. The Directors have the patronage of the East at their disposal; but, indirectly, ministers participate in its advantages. The latter we have seen have a negative on the appointments of the principal servants of the Company, besides which the general superintendence they exercise over India affairs, through the medium of the Board of Control, renders it highly improbable the Directors should neglect to provide for any individual backed by a ministerial recommendation; more especially as the favour might be so easily returned.

We may conclude this part of our subject with remarking that the whole patronage and influence of India is so much added to that of the general government of the empire. The India-House is little more than a branch of the general administration, where a part of the business of the Government is transacted, and with which it is almost as much connected as with the Home-office or Treasury department. The case of the notorious Paul Benfield strikingly illustrates the reciprocal working of the two systems. This man, whose "offal," Burke said, "ought to have fed the region kites," had at one time no fewer than eight members in parliament, and he attempted to bring in one of his agents for the City of London. These members were returned at Benfield's expense to support the Pitt Ministry; and in return for this

support Mr. Pitt allowed Benfield to set up some imaginary and exaggerated pecuniary claims against the Nabob of Arcot.*

The great mass of influence arises from appointments in India, but the political influence of the Company is very considerable from the vast number of individuals employed in their different warehouses and establishments in London. All the influence they possess is employed in support of their parliamentary interest.

Whenever a labourer comes into the service of the Company he is required to state for what place he has a vote for a member of parliament: his name is then registered with this specification; and on an election he is told that he will be spared from his situation to give his suffrage, if he will vote according to orders: disobedience being supposed to be punished by dismissal from his office. The number of individuals thus kept in political subjection to the Company is about four thousand.

This fact needs no comment. It sufficiently identifies the East-India Company with Government, and we may consider the revenue of Hindustan, as well as the revenue of England, as forming a part of that immense expenditure by which the *Borough-System* is supported.

TERRITORIAL REVENUES AND COMMERCE OF INDIA.

The fiscal system of India is distinguished by a peculiarity which is without parallel in Europe. The rental of the soil, in lieu of being monopolized by an oppressive aristocracy, is applied to defray the charges of government, the support of a military force, and the expense of the judicial administration. The Hindoos are, happily, unacquainted with the custom-duties, the excise-duties, and assessed taxes, which weigh down industry and abridge enjoyments in England. In the East, the state takes about one-fifth of the gross produce of the land, and that satisfies nearly all its wants. Other taxes are inconsiderable; as the transit-duties, stamps, licenses, and judicial fees. The monopoly of salt and opium is also a source of income. But the principal source of revenue is the land-tax, which constituted the only rent payable by the cultivators of the soil, under the Hindoo and Mahomedan sovereigns.

The gross revenues of India, in the year 1827, amounted to £23,383,497; the expenditure, inclusive of the interest of the debt, to £23,323,179. The chief items of expenditure are the military, civil, and revenue establishments; salaries, pensions, superannuation-allowances, and stipends payable to deposed princes.

The total amount of territorial debts in India, in the same year, was £42,870,876; the interest of the debt £1,749,068. By some writers

* The commissioners appointed to investigate the debts of this Nabob finished their labours in the course of the present year. They have occupied in this notable job exactly a quarter of a century. The claims set up against the Nabob amounted to £30,404,919; the commissioners have allowed £2,686,146.—Parl. Rep. No. 114, Sess. 1830.

the debt of India is considered to operate in the same way as the borough-debt in England; by rendering a large class of persons interested in the permanency of the British power. This is a one-sided view of the question, which it is hardly worth while stopping to answer. Creditors may feel an interest in their debtors, of the same kind as that which subsists between a lord and his vassal; but this sort of relation does not tend to increase mutual attachment. A government, by incurring debt, may create a partial interest in its stability, but this advantage must be far more than counterbalanced by alienating the vast majority, in consequence of the additional burthens which the debt renders necessary; and, in the foreign transactions of such a government, its power and influence are weakened by a knowledge of its financial encumbrances.

Leaving, however, this matter, as irrelevant to our immediate purpose, let us continue the inquiry into the finances of India. The Company have never been able to realize a surplus revenue from their territorial possessions. All the income they have derived from Indian taxation has been expended in defraying the salaries of their servants, in the maintenance of a numerous army, and other establishments necessary to the preservation of their power. The only source of surplus income for the payment of the interest of their capital stock, and other outgoings, has been the *commercial profits* arising from their exclusive privileges. The nature of these profits it will be proper to explain, in order to prepare the way for a few observations on the renewal of the Company's charter.

The commercial profits of the Company are chiefly derived from their monopoly of the trade *in tea*. The following statement shows the difference between the prime cost of tea at Canton and its price at the East-India sales in London, from which an estimate may be formed of the profit on this article:—

Tea purchased at Canton.

Years.	lbs.	Prime cost. £	Average price per lb.
1824-25....	28,697,088....	1,900,866....	1s. 4d. nearly.
1825-26....	27,821,121....	1,729,949....	1s. 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. „
1826-27....	40,182,241....	2,368,461....	1s. 2d. „
1827-28....	33,269,333....	2,086,971....	1s. 3d. „

Sales in England.

Years.	lbs.	Sale price. £	Average price per lb.
1825-26....	27,803,668....	3,872,685....	2s. 10d. nearly.
1826-27....	27,700,978....	3,485,092....	2s. 6d. „
1827-28....	28,120,354....	3,358,955....	2s. 5d. „
1828-29....	28,230,383....	3,286,272....	2s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. „

It thus appears the Company charge considerably more than 100 per cent. additional to the prime cost on all the teas consumed in the king-

dom. It is almost the only article of traffic in which they realize a profit. Their exports to China consist almost entirely of woollens, and this branch of trade is wholly unproductive.

The Company has lately sent little merchandize to India, except military stores, which, being charged to the territorial account, do not enter into a statement of commercial profits. It imports, however, to a considerable amount, from that country, raw silk, indigo, and other articles. Whether there is any profit or loss in the trade it is difficult to determine from the accounts submitted to parliament.*

In addition to the profits on its trade, the Company is entitled to a certain duty upon goods imported by the private and privileged trade, warehoused and sold through its medium. From the gross profits arising from this trade, a large deduction is to be made for the expense of freight and demurrage, amounting, in 1829, to £662,964. After paying all the other expenses of the commercial establishment, interest on the bond-debt, &c. the dividend remains to be provided. The capital stock of the Company is £6,000,000; so that, at $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it requires a net profit of £620,000 per annum to pay the dividend.

Now these preliminaries bring us to the consideration of a very important issue between the public and the East-India Company. The Company, we have seen, has not realized a surplus revenue from their territorial acquisitions; that has been all expended in the charges of war and government. Commercial profits, then, are the only source from which the Company has a surplus-revenue to pay the dividends and support their home-establishments. But, it appears, the profits of the Company on the several branches of trade, are either none at all, or very unimportant, except in the single article of tea. So that, in fact, it is the people of England who pay the dividends of the proprietors, and other outgoings, in the monopoly price of their teas. Let us inquire whether this is conformable to the agreement between the Company and the public.

The act of the 24th Geo. III. c. 38, provides that there shall be at least four sales in every year, at which there shall be put up such quantities of tea as shall be judged *equal to the demand*; that the tea so put up shall be sold, without reserve, to the highest bidder, provided an advance of one penny per pound shall be bid upon the *prices at which the same shall be put up*; and that it shall not be lawful for the Company "to put up their tea for sale at any prices which shall, upon the whole of the teas so put up, at any one sale, exceed the *prime cost* thereof, with the *freight* and *charges* of importation, together with lawful *interest* from the time of the arrival of such tea in Great Britain and the common premium of insurance, as a compensation for the sea-risk incurred therein."

Here are the terms of the contract between the community and the merchants of Leadenhall: the latter are to supply the former with a

* Considerations Relative to the Renewal of the Company's Charter, p. 41.

quantity of tea adequate to their demand, and, to prevent extortion in the price, all the items of charge which the Company, in addition to the prime cost, are allowed to include in the put-up price, are distinctly specified; but there is no item for the *Company's dividends*, and it was certainly never intended they should be paid out of the profits of the tea-trade. All the legislature contemplated was to reimburse the Company the prime cost of their teas and reasonable charges, but never that they should be enabled to realize an exorbitant profit applicable to their general expenditure. That this profit has been realized is proved from a statement submitted to the Committee of the House of Commons last session, which shows that the profits on the China trade for the last fifteen years amounted to £16,971,316. Had the trade with China been open, the Company must have been satisfied with the ordinary mercantile profit; they could not have taxed the public to the amount of upwards of one million per annum, to provide a fund not only for the payment of the dividend upon India Stock and the interest of their bond debt, but also materially to aid their wasteful Indian expenditure.

Next let us inquire in what relation the Company and the public stand in respect to the trade to India, exclusive of China.

In 1813 the trade to India was thrown open to private merchants, but was still, in some measure, impeded by enactments which required that all ships passing to the eastward of the Cape of Good Hope should exceed 350 tons of burthen, and which rendered it necessary to procure a license to trade from the Court of Directors, or, upon their refusal, from the Board of Control. This act also provided that certain articles of Indian produce should be brought to the port of London alone. British ships were still prevented from trading between ports without the kingdom, and places within the limits of the East-India Company's charter. These restrictions were much relaxed in 1823. The export of military stores to India is reserved to the Company, but ships, without limitation to burthen, may clear out, unlicensed, for any place eastward of the Cape of Good Hope, except for minor ports between the Indus and Malacca. A license is still necessary to proceed to any other except the four principal settlements—Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Prince of Wales's Island, within these limits. Vessels returning from India may now be admitted to entry in any of the warehousing ports of Great Britain, and trade is permitted between foreign ports and places within the limits of the Company's charter.

The effect of opening the trade to India has been greatly to increase its amount. The highest value of goods exported to India in any year between 1792 and 1811 did not exceed £2,475,987 (the exports of 1808). It will be seen, hereafter, that this amount is less than one half of the value of the present exports. The increase has chiefly taken place in the export of cotton-manufactured goods. Previous to 1813 the amount of cotton goods exported to India was very trifling. They now fall very little short of £2,000,000 in value annually. This augmentation may partly be attributed to the extraordinary improvement

which has taken place in our manufactures, attended by a great reduction of price, and to the extension and consolidation of the British power in India.

The following statements show at once the comparative exports and imports of the Company and the free and privileged trade in their transactions with India and China.

Exports by the Private Trade.

Years.	Total to India and China. £	By the Private Trade. £
1825	3,918,071	2,574,660
1826	4,468,883	2,625,888
1827	5,201,599	3,903,006
1828	5,212,353	4,085,426

Exports by the East-India Company.

Years.	Merchandise for Sale. £	Stores. £	Total. £
1825-26	754,832	501,518	1,256,350
1826-27	826,055	907,833	1,733,888
1827-28	494,922	807,354	1,302,276
1828-29	636,441	462,369	1,098,810

Imports from India and China.

Years.	By the Company. £	By the Private Trade. £	Total. £
1825	5,375,492	5,178,925	10,554,417
1826	5,076,360	5,162,509	10,688,869
1827	6,148,077	4,514,661	10,662,738
1828	5,576,905	5,643,671	11,220,576

These statements show clearly the benefits which have resulted to the community from the opening of the trade to India and the outlet it has afforded to British industry and manufactures. From the first, it appears, the exports by the private trade to the east nearly doubled in four years; while from the second it appears the exports of the Company, during the same period, and under similar favourable circumstances, have declined rather than augmented. What more can be required to establish the advantages of free trade, and the greater results which may be anticipated from the frugality, activity, and enterprise of individuals than from the expensive, negligent, and drowsy proceedings of chartered monopolies?

It is worthy of observation that the most enlightened servants of the Company doubted whether the natives of India would ever be brought to consume largely European manufactures. Experience has falsified their representations. Similar results may be confidently expected from the opening of the trade to China.

RENEWAL OF THE CHARTER OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY.

Such improvements in the national representation, as would insure an honest and enlightened government, would render unnecessary any great changes in the scheme of our Indian administration. Ministers, having the control of the affairs of India, are responsible for their management; and, provided the people of England had an adequate control over them, there would be little risk of misgovernment, either in Great Britain or her great dependency. But if a system is tolerated, which admits of the accession to power of corrupt and incapable men, the calamity is felt in every part of the empire. Hence, the happiness of the vast population of Hindustan, no less than that of the United Kingdom, is identified in the great question of parliamentary reform.

The government of India, it appears to us, must always be so constituted as to be subordinate to the general government. Equality would generate rivalry; rivalry, hostility; and this last be the source of mutual weakness and annoyance. All these evils are obviated by the supremacy of the Board of Control. The sovereigns of Leadenhall can never compete with the sovereigns of Downing-street; yet, though the dependence of the former is secured, it is not so far merged in the latter as to preclude them from the exercise of a distinct and separate administration.

Another advantage results from the existing system in the division of *India patronage*. Supposing the Company deprived of their territorial authority, by whom could the immense patronage of India be exercised? It was the principle of the India bills of Mr. Fox to vest the patronage of India in a Board, emanating from parliament and independent of the Crown; but, in the present constitution of the House of Commons, this was only adding to the power and emolument of the Aristocracy. Again, to vest India patronage in ministers would be not less objectionable; it would form an enormous addition to the overwhelming influence of the Crown. The Court of Directors, however, though they have some interests in common with the Oligarchy and executive government, are not directly identified with either; they are a different power, based on different interests; their constituency are neither pot-wollopers, burgage-holders, nor freeholders—they are proprietors of India Stock; and this is a qualification from which neither the peerage nor the House of Commons derive their ascendancy. Under this arrangement a diversion of influence is obtained, and the danger to public liberty, which might result from consolidating the patronage of India with that of the United Kingdom, is in some measure averted.

In our opinion, then, the Company ought to retain their political sovereignty, and for this plain reason—that we do not see by what other constituted authority their functions could be discharged with less danger to the community. But though we think the general plan of the Indian government cannot be greatly improved, we are not insensible to the defects in its practical administration. The different departments

of the Company's administration, we have little doubt, are more pregnant with abuse, if that be possible, than the borough system itself. But this is a question wholly distinct from that we have been investigating, and into the merits of which we are not prepared to enter. There are, however, a few points bearing on this branch of the subject so notorious, that we cannot forbear noticing them, and trusting that they will receive modification in the approaching renewal of the Company's charter.

For instance, it appears a monstrous abuse, that the directors, who are only chosen for four years, should virtually exercise their functions for life. Of the twenty-four directors, six are obliged to retire every year in rotation; but, instead of withdrawing entirely, they secede for one year only, being sure, as a matter of course, of being re-elected for another four years when the period of probation expires, and so on to the end of their lives, through the influence of their co-directors: for which purpose their names are enrolled on what is termed the "House List," in Leadenhall-street.

The number of proprietors of India-Stock is about 2,200. In the choice of directors, £1,000 stock gives one vote; £3,000 stock two votes; £6,000 stock three votes; and £10,000 stock four votes. This is the principle of the select-vestry system, without the same justification. There is nothing analogous to it in the election of members of parliament, and it is as unsuitable in the choice of the governors of an empire, as if the members of the House of Commons were each to have votes proportioned to the magnitude of their rent-roll.

Among the prerogatives which the Company exercise, one is justly objectionable, namely, the power of denying to British subjects permission to reside in India. By the 53d Geo. III. c. 155, heavy penalties are imposed upon any British subject who shall proceed to India without license from the Directors or Board of Control. The local governments are also empowered, if they see fit, to send home any European residing there, even though in possession of a license. It is also enacted that no British subject shall reside in the interior, at a greater distance than ten miles from the presidencies, without a certificate of leave from the local authorities. Till a very late period, no European was allowed to hold lands either as proprietor or upon lease. By a recent regulation, however, of the present governor-general, the indigo planters have been permitted to take leases of lands from the natives for the cultivation of the plant.

Such restrictions are an arbitrary abridgment of the rights of locomotion and enterprise, for which we have never seen any adequate justification. No danger can possibly result from the free settlement of Englishmen in India. The whole European community scattered through this vast region, exclusive of those in the service of the company, does not exceed 3,000, and any increase in their number, so as to excite apprehension, is wholly improbable. Were it not so, the Company can have no right to exercise an authority injurious both to their fellow subjects and the native population, merely for the sake of perpetuating their own power.

Lastly, the freedom of the press in India requires a more constitutional guarantee than the capricious censorship of the governor-general.

Having shortly noticed the political part of the India question, let us come to the commercial branch of the subject. This is the real point of interest to the people of Great Britain. Comparatively, the future territorial government of Hindustan is unimportant, but every inhabitant of the United Kingdom is deeply interested in a free trade to China; and we sincerely trust this interest will not be compromised—that there will be no renewal of the Company's charter, without an entire abolition of their commercial monopoly.

A defence of some kind may be always devised by artful persons for every abuse and every oppression; but we cannot collect from the inquiries of the Parliamentary Committees of last Session that any, the least plausible, case, has been made out to justify the commercial privileges of the Company. There is nothing in the constitution of the Chinese government, in its peculiar policy, in the local usages of the natives, nor in their anti-commercial spirit to interdict the opening of the trade. Both the public officers of China and the people are a thrifty race, and the same motives of interest, which actuate the British merchant, concur to induce them to desire a more extended mercantile intercourse with this country.

Why then should this spirit—the mutual interests of two empires—be cramped by the costly and cumbersome incubus of Leadenhall-street? The Court of Directors have sufficient to engage their attention in the discharge of their political functions, without being fettered by mercantile pursuits; and the sooner they divest themselves of the remnant of their commercial character, the better for both England and Hindustan. The Company has become a great political government and is no more adapted to the pursuits of commerce than the imperial parliament.

The trade with China neither requires the capital, nor united action of a privileged association. The French, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Danes, the Austrians, and Americans, all resort to Canton, and none of them carry on the intercourse through the intervention of an exclusive company. The Dutch trade, which is the most important, used to be conducted by a privileged company, but it is now thrown open. The free trade of the Americans with China has greatly augmented since 1814;—and, what is most extraordinary, they actually export to Canton British manufactures—manufactures, which the English merchant is interdicted exporting, and which the Company cannot export with a profit, owing to their circuitous and costly mode of transacting business—to the unfitness of their institutions for commercial purposes.

After such facts as these have been established in evidence, ought it to be any longer a question whether the commercial privileges of the Company ought to be renewed? We think decidedly not. The interests of the public are directly opposed to the monopoly. For years we have been paying double the prices for our teas we ought to pay; double the prices that are paid on the Continent and America; where there are no privileged associations. And for what purpose are the people of the

United Kingdom subjected to this extortion? Why, in addition to our other burthens, should we be made to pay two millions per annum for the benefit of the Company? We are becoming a sober people—a tea-drinking nation, and why should this improvement in national character be obstructed by overgrown monopolists? The reason is this: The finances of the Company are embarrassed. They cannot pay their DIVIDEND out of fair mercantile profits, and they seek to pay it out of the produce of a poll-tax levied on the people of England!

Here is the gist of the matter at issue between the Company and the public. The question is not the policy of a *free-trade* with China; on this point no well-informed person can entertain a doubt: the interests of commerce, the interests of the people at large, and of the public revenue of the country would all be promoted by free trade; but then how are the Company's dividend, the interest of their bond debt, and other out-goings to be paid? They have no surplus territorial revenue; the profits of the TEA-TRADE are their sole dependence. This is the rub! But what, it may be asked, have the community to do with the pecuniary difficulties of a knot of intriguing, ambitious, and improvident speculators? What is India to England? Some thousands of adventurers have amassed princely fortunes there by rapine and extortion, and have returned to spend them in this country, to add to the aristocracy of wealth already too predominant. Beyond this we have derived no advantage from our eastern acquisitions—neither true glory nor national happiness. Why should we then be called upon to make a sacrifice? If the Company cannot maintain their association without public support; if they cannot carry on trade to advantage, without privileges hurtful to the community; if they cannot enter into fair competition with individuals, let them retire from the contest—let them DISSOLVE, and leave commerce to be pursued by others on more prudent and economical principles.

Only think of the situation of that most patient of all animals, the British public, in this business. The boroughmongers levy a *hundred per cent. tax on tea* for the support of extravagance, and the payment of their dividends, and the Company a monopoly tax to the same amount, and for similar purposes. How finely is JOHN BULL crucified between the *exclusives* of Leadenhall and the oppressors of Downing-street! If to these agreeables, we add the extra sugar-tax he is compelled to pay for the benefit of the West-India flaggellants, with what gusto he must needs swallow his morning and evening beverage; what fervent ejaculations he must utter over his *cups* for the prosperity and permanence of oligarchical government!

There is, however, one resource to the Company, in lieu of the profits of the exclusive trade to China—they may RETRENCH. Like their prototype, the Borough-System, they are embarrassed from a long course of war and prodigality, and they must economize. The people of England will never submit to be taxed for the maintenance of their territorial sovereignty and patronage. They must reduce still further than they have yet done their military, civil, judicial, and revenue establishments; they must curtail enormous salaries, and their

“dead-weight;” be less lavish in granting pensions, superannuations, and allowances to relatives and dependents. And if all this is not enough, they must, instead of bartering offices and appointments in India for the benefit of themselves, sell them openly and fairly to meet their expenditure. At all events, they may rely upon it, that they will not be allowed to tax the community, neither one, two, nor three millions per annum after the 10th of April, 1834.

In support of the allegations at the close of this article, we ought to have mentioned a few facts confirmatory of our opinions, which we were well enabled to do from the inquiries of the parliamentary committees of last session.

We have said, that we are becoming a “tea-drinking nation;” here is the proof from the statement submitted to the Commons’ Committee, by Mr. Crawford, of the comparative consumption per head, of tea and coffee in Great Britain, France, and the United States.

	Tea.				Coffee.		
	lbs.	oz.	dwt.		lbs.	oz.	dwt.
Great Britain	1	7	8	0	10	14
France	-	-	-	0	9	13
United States	0	9	4	2	1	11

Several statements were submitted to the Committee, with a view of showing the amount of the tax entailed on the community by the Company’s exclusive privilege; by one witness it was estimated at £1,500,000 per annum; by another at £1,727,934, and by a third at £2,588,499.

For a comparative statement of the prices at which teas are sold by the Company, and on the continent, and in America, we must refer to the statement of Dr. Kelly, No. 4709, of the Lords’ Committee. The prices at the Company’s sales in London, exclusive of government duty, are about double those in the countries mentioned.

From a statement of Mr. Melvill, auditor-general to the Company, it appears, the gross revenue of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay in the year 1828, was £22,551,617; of this revenue, £15,384,528 was the produce of the land-tax: the charges of collecting the revenue, pensions, &c. £5,524,728. The charge for collecting the gross revenue of the United Kingdom, amounting to £57,650,029, is £3,797,038.

The following returns, by the auditor-general of the Company, exhibit a statement of the military charges, the general civil charges, and the judicial charges of the three Presidencies for the year 1828:—

	Military Charges.	General Civil Charges.	Judicial Charges.
Bengal	£4,747,224	£1,791,508	£1,147,436
Madras	3,926,267	360,484	377,158
Bombay	2,111,222	542,202	312,222
Total	<u>£10,784,713</u>	<u>£2,694,204</u>	<u>£1,836,816</u>

Can any one believe the Company will not be able to find resources from such lavish outgoings, without a monopoly profit on the consumption of tea?

THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

THERE is a class of politicians in this country with just one idea; and that idea is, there is nothing good in public economy unless it is conducive to the accumulation of capital. The distribution of wealth is a consideration of no importance; their only object being to heap it up in masses, no matter how disproportioned, provided the total amount is augmented. For this purpose, they have been always recommending the indefinite enlargement of farms, the substitution of machinery for manual labour, and the establishment of banks of credit and paper-money. That their principles are true in the abstract, and that the application of them, within certain limits, and under certain circumstances, would be beneficial, we have little doubt; but their unqualified and precipitate adoption would, in our opinion, be productive of disastrous consequences. In every case, we believe, they tend to augment the aggregate wealth of the community, but not the aggregate amount of social happiness. National happiness, however, is more important than national wealth; and a system which would compromise the former for the attainment of the latter, sacrifices the end to the means. The direct tendency of the principles of the economists is to destroy the intermediate links of society; or, more correctly, to consolidate them in one end of the chain;—to replace the feudal aristocracy, from which Europe has suffered so much, with a monied aristocracy more base in its origin, more revolting in its associations, and more inimical to general freedom and enjoyments.

The history of banking affords an apt illustration of the practical working of the dogmas of the Ricardo school. Banking has always been the favourite invention of these theorists, as tending most effectually to the extension of credit, the development of industry, and accumulation of capital. These are its natural results; but such advantages may be more than counterbalanced by an alloy of accompanying evils. In England, we consider the system of credit founded on paper-money to have been the chief auxiliary and main stay of the reckless and unprincipled government of the last forty years. This is not the only evil: it

has exercised a baneful influence on domestic economy, by giving an undue ascendancy to particular branches of industry—the commercial and manufacturing, for instance; it has given an artificial impulse to population,—multiplying the number of the people beyond the means of permanent employment and subsistence; it has created a vast monied interest, whose sole element is war, gambling, and speculation; it has been a principal cause of over-trading, of mercantile revulsions and vicissitudes, and the endless source of frauds, litigation, arrests, insolvencies, and bankruptcies.

These evils, it will be alleged, are not inherent in banking, but have been the consequences of banking conducted on *unsound* principles. Granted: but who forewarned the community the principles were unsound while the system was in its full career of fallacious prosperity? Certainly not the political economists. They were as little prescient as others; and, like others, only learnt from experience. Similar results have flowed from other branches of their science. They discovered that a *saving* might be effected by farming on a great scale, and by manufacturing on a great scale; but they could discern nothing further: they could not discern the political, the social, and moral calamities which would flow from the aggregation of great capitals in agricultural and manufacturing industry.

It is this want of foresight of practical consequences which ought to make us cautious in adopting the maxims of the economists. France has recently passed through the same ordeal as England. During the summer, she has been suffering precisely from the same causes as those which produced such wide-spread distress in this country in 1811, 1815, and 1825, and the sudden collapse of an extensive system of banking, credit, and mercantile paper, by occasioning great pecuniary embarrassments, threatened, at one period, to impede the full triumph of her glorious revolution.

We shall, however, leave these topics to come to our more immediate object,—the origin and present state of the powerful corporation in Threadneedle-street—the great foster-parent of banking, credit, and paper-money in this country. In treating of the Bank of England, there appear to be three objects particularly deserving of our attention. *First*, a brief outline of the origin and connexion of the Bank with government. *Secondly*, the enormous profits it has derived, and the immense wealth it has accumulated from that connexion. *Thirdly*, its present state and influence. We shall treat on each subject as briefly as possible, so as to put the reader in possession of the most important facts necessary to a knowledge of them.

The Bank had its origin in war and taxation; and was originally projected by one Paterson, a Scotchman. William III. who introduced standing armies, the excise-laws, the funding system, and other calamities, wanted money to carry on a *vigorous* war against the French. An act passed, inviting people to make voluntary advances to the amount of £1,500,000; and, for securing the payment of the interest, taxes were laid upon beer, ale, and other liquors. Upon condition of

£1,200,000 of this sum being advanced within a certain time, the subscribers were to be incorporated; and, this being done, the incorporation took place, and the subscribers were formed into a trading company, called "The Governor and Company of the Bank of England." The charter of corporation was executed July 27, 1694; and directs, among other things, that a governor or deputy-governor, and twenty-four directors, shall be chosen for conducting the establishment. For the £1,200,000 lent to government, they were to receive yearly £100,000; £96,000, the interest at eight per cent. and £4000 for the charges of management. Their loan to government might be redeemed on a year's notice; and, in that case, the charter and company to expire.

Such is the origin of the Bank; on which, one or two remarks may be made. It is clear, from the act of incorporation, (the 5 & 6 William and Mary,) that nothing more than the establishment of a company of traders, or pawnbrokers, was intended; and that it never was surmised that they would ever form a part of, or have any dominant influence in, the government. The act specifies, very particularly, the sort of trade they were to carry on: they were not to trade in goods or merchandise, but to employ their capital in advancing money on goods and pledges,* in discounting bills of exchange, and the buying and selling of gold and silver bullion; with a permission, however, to sell such goods as were mortgaged to them, and not redeemed within three months after the expiration of the time of redemption.

But, still further to confine these traders and pawnbrokers to their province, and prevent any further connexion with the executive, of which the parliament of that day appears to have been somewhat apprehensive, the same law of William and Mary imposes a penalty upon the directors if they purchase, on account of the corporation, any crown lands, or if they advance to his Majesty any sum of money, by way of loan or anticipation of any branch of the public revenue, other than on such funds only on which a credit is or shall be granted by parliament. Contrary to this clause, and notwithstanding the penalty, the directors continued to make advances from time to time, on treasury bills, to the year 1793. In that year, Mr. Bosanquet was governor; he had some doubt of the legality of these advances, and applied for a bill of indemnity: the Bank having then become an essential part of the government, this was easily obtained; and an act was passed to protect the governor and company from any penalties they had incurred, or might incur in future, on account of any advances to government.

Another circumstance connected with the early history of the Bank

* It was only during the commercial crisis of 1826 that Lord Liverpool discovered the Bank was empowered to make advances on goods and merchandize; the directors, it appears, were as ignorant of the existence of this dormant privilege as his lordship, having been too much occupied with their more ostentatious and profitable dealings with the Treasury to attend to the humble avocation set forth by the *three balls*.

is in the mode of issuing its notes. For above sixty years, no notes were issued for a less sum than £20; and these were made payable, not to any particular person, but to the bearer, on *demand*; and for the amount of which notes, in the legal coin of the realm, the Company was liable to be sued and arrested. As the Bank enlarged its advances to government, it became necessary to lower the denomination of its notes. A different reason has been assigned; but this, no doubt, is the true one. It is clear, indeed, that the real capital of the Bank being a limited sum, it could only have money to lend to government by increasing its fictitious capital; in other words, by extending its issues of paper; which again could only be done by lowering the denomination of its notes. While £20 notes alone were issued, their circulation, from their amount, being limited to the commercial and trading classes, no great quantity of paper could possibly be emitted; but when notes of the value of 15, 10, 5, and 1 pound were issued, their circulation extending through all classes of the community, the issue of Bank paper would proportionately increase. Government, therefore, in order to obtain advances from the Bank, readily permitted the issuing of notes of smaller value. In the war of 1755, the Bank began to put out notes of the value of £15; and before the conclusion of that war, notes of the value of £10. At the commencement of the Anti-Jacobin war, in 1793, they were still further indulged, and allowed to issue £5 notes; and, lastly, in the year 1797, came the £1 and £2 notes. Rents, wages, salaries, taxes, and every thing else, could now be paid in Bank paper; and the Restriction-Act having protected the Bank from the necessity of taking up their own notes, they were issued in prodigious quantities; and in exactly the same proportion the Bank enlarged its advances to government. The following statement, extracted from the report of the committee of the House of Lords, in 1819, of the amount of Bank paper in circulation in different years; and of the amount of the sums advanced to government on exchequer-bills, and other government securities, will show the connexion which has subsisted between the issue of paper and advances to government:—

	Bank Notes.	Advances.
1794.....	£10,963,380.....	£ 8,786,514
1795.....	13,539,160.....	11,114,230
1796.....	11,030,110.....	11,718,730
1814.....	25,511,012.....	23,607,300
1815.....	27,155,824.....	27,156,000
1816.....	26,681,398.....	26,042,600
1817.....	27,339,768.....	25,399,510
1818.....	27,954,558.....	27,002,000

Having shown the causes which led to the issue of small notes, and the connexion betwixt the issue of Bank paper and advances to government, we shall now mention some other points connected with the history of this company.

Without the assistance of the Bank the immense fabric of debt and taxation could not have been reared. Of this government appears to have been soon sensible, from the numerous laws enacted for its encouragement and protection. To prevent competition, by the statute 6th of Queen Ann, it is enacted, that no other banking company of more than *six persons*, shall issue notes payable in less than six months. Innumerable acts have passed, imposing the penalty of death for forging Bank notes; others, the punishment of transportation, on persons uttering, or having them in their possession. The English code has been made the bloodiest in the world, in order to uphold the Bank, and its laws more savage than those of Draco. But of these, and also the Restriction Act, we shall speak shortly; let us now only attend to those laws for upholding the credit of its paper.

After the Restriction-Act, the Bank ceased to be an independent company; it was a mere government office, of which the governor and directors had the management; and which issued a *forced* government paper. Paper issued under such circumstances would necessarily depreciate; and this was an evil which it was of importance to government, as far as possible, to prevent. Having by *force* kept bank-notes in circulation, it seemed a slight extension of the same desperate principle to attempt also by *force* to maintain their credit. Various laws were passed for this purpose. After the Restriction-Act, a law passed to protect debtors from arrest, who tendered payment in notes, though they still continued liable to a common action for debt, to compel payment in guineas. This was the first attempt of the borough-mongers to render Bank paper a *legal tender*, and equivalent to gold. In 1810, when paper had depreciated 30 per cent., and guineas sold for from 25s. to 28s. in bank-notes, a law passed to punish persons pursuing this traffic, and imposing penalties on those who sold them for their *real* value in paper. Tenants, who offered notes for rent, were protected from distress, though liable to a common action of debt or ejectment. At length, in 1811, Lord King having given notice to his tenants to pay their rents in guineas, the legal coin of the realm, an act passed to protect persons, tendering payment in notes, from all further proceedings. This was the finish. Bank paper was now a *legal tender* to all intents and purposes; and by the fiat of the Oligarchy, old rags were metamorphosed into gold. Even this was not enough to satisfy the omnipotent parliament; they actually passed a resolution, declaring a one-pound bank-note and a shilling equal in value to a guinea, though the latter was openly selling for twenty-seven shillings!

Let us now revert to the capital part of Bank legislation—the *Restriction-Act*. By turning to the preceding page, and observing the amount of the Bank advances to government in the year 1796, and reflecting on the various laws enacted in favour of the Company, it will appear that an intimate connexion and mutual dependence had been created betwixt the Bank and Government, before the Restriction-Act, in 1797; that law, however, completely incorporated the Bank with church and state. The causes which produced the stoppage were briefly these:—

From the commencement of the year 1797, great apprehensions were entertained of a French invasion: the people were alarmed for the stability of the government, consequently for the stability of the Bank, which depended upon the government: a run upon the Bank ensued: the credit of the establishment was endangered; and *suspicion*, which PAINE justly denominates *credit* asleep, was now awakened. The run on the Bank continued hourly to increase, till Saturday, the 25th of February, 1797. This was the last day the Bank was compelled to pay their notes on demand, agreeably to the tenor of their notes, and the conditions on which they had been issued. The alarm not being likely to subside, and the run continuing to increase till the latest hour the Bank was open, on the next day, *Sunday*, an order was issued from the Privy Council, requiring the Bank to *forbear issuing any more cash*, till the sense of parliament could be taken on the subject. This order, as might be expected, was instantly obeyed. A few days more would have drawn out of the Bank coffers the last farthing of cash and bullion. The Company wished anxiously to conceal the amount of specie in their possession at the time of the stoppage; but, by an ingenious calculation of Mr. Allardyce, this point was subsequently ascertained almost to a certainty. It appears, that, on the 25th of February, the last day of payment, the notes in circulation amounted to £8,640,250, and the total amount of cash and bullion in the Bank, to only *one million two hundred and seventy two thousand pounds*.

The Bank, like true traders, has always manifested great anxiety about the *credit of the house*, and endeavoured to make it appear that the stoppage did not originate in the necessities of the Bank, but the necessities of the government. In the resolutions of a court of directors, on the 25th March, 1797, affixed to the second report of the Bank committee of 1819, it is said, "That the restriction on cash payments was altogether a measure of *state necessity*." Whether it originated in the necessities of the Bank, or of the boroughmongers, or both—the latter appears most probable—it is not very material to inquire: but it appears, that on the last day of payment, the Bank had little more than a *million* of cash and bullion to pay more than *eight millions* of their notes; and how, under such circumstances, the Bank could have met their creditors, or what could have protected them from arrest for debt, but the interference of government, it is not easy to conceive.

But the fact is, the stoppage was concerted betwixt Mr. Pitt and the directors. Sometime before the order in council was issued, Mr. Bosanquet and other directors had had repeated interviews with that minister, to consult how the run could be stayed, and the Company saved from impending bankruptcy. The last interview was on the 22d of February; the directors were then in a terrible fright; they told the minister they were "alarmed for the safety of the house;" and asked him, when "he would think it necessary to interfere." Pitt interfered on the following Sunday: a singular day for the consummation of this extraordinary transaction. Immediately after, the Bank had recourse to a great deal of dissimulation to disguise their bankruptcy from

the public. On the 2d of March, six days after the stoppage, a court of proprietors was called. Mr. Bosanquet, who waited on Pitt to express his fears for the "safety of the house," and to know when ministers would interfere, was present. After expatiating on the *THEN prosperous state* of Bank affairs, this gentleman told the proprietors that he earnestly hoped they would soon be *permitted* to pay their notes, as usual, in cash. Thanks were then voted to the directors for *complying* with the order in council, which empowered them to violate their engagements to the public with impunity, and refuse payment for their notes. All this was excellent. Mr. Bosanquet "earnestly hoped" that they would be *permitted* to do that which he had earnestly petitioned Pitt they might be protected from doing; and the proprietors gravely thanked the directors for *complying* with their own earnest request!

The Order in Council, requiring the Bank to issue no more cash, was issued on the 26th of February. The Restriction-Act received the royal assent on the 3d of May, and was to continue in force till the 24th of June, that is, only for *fifty-two days*. On the 22d of June, two days before the expiration of the original act, it was renewed till one month after the next session of Parliament. This was the *first* renewal; the *second* renewal was in 1798, to continue till *one month* after the signing of a definitive treaty of peace. Peace came in 1801; but, before the expiration of the month, the *third* renewal was passed, to continue till the 1st of March, 1803; before that time, notwithstanding peace continued, a *fourth* renewal passed to continue till six weeks after the next session of Parliament. In the interim war broke out; the *fifth* renewal followed as a matter of course, and to continue till the signing of a definitive treaty of peace. In 1814, plaguy peace came again to put these deluders to the test; but before the expiration of the six months, the *sixth* renewal passed, to continue only one year. In 1816, the country being at peace, every one expected the law would expire; when, lo! it was renewed the *seventh* time, for two years! In 1818, it was again renewed, for the *eighth* time, for one year; and in 1819, it was renewed for the *ninth* time, and the Bank protected from payment of its notes in statutable coin for four years.

This was the last renewal, the Bank in 1823 resuming payments in specie, after a suspension of twenty-six years. It was thought by many, and confidently predicted by some, such an event could not possibly happen. These views were fallacious, originating in misconception; all that was requisite to enable the Bank to fulfil its engagements were a general peace, public confidence, and such a favourable state of the exchange as would enable it to obtain a supply of the precious metals adequate to meet the probable demand for gold in lieu of paper. These circumstances concurring at the period fixed for the resumption of cash-payments, the Bank resumed its ancient course of business, and an event to which such undue importance had been previously attached, was actually consummated without exciting the least interest or attention.

One of the greatest calamities resulting from the suspension of cash-payments by the Bank, and consequent inundation of the country with small notes, was the vast increase in the number of prosecutions for forgery. It appears, from returns to parliament, that, in the interval from 1797 to 1818, the Bank instituted 998 prosecutions either for forging, uttering, or having forged notes in possession. The results of these prosecutions were a dreadful sacrifice of human life; and it has been calculated that four hundred victims were offered up in the space of twenty-one years to the MOLOCH of paper money.

Another evil may be justly charged to the vast amount of paper issued by the Bank of England; the great extent of their circulation gave them a complete control over the national currency, which enabled them, at their own arbitrary discretion, merely by contracting or enlarging their issues, to *determine the prices* of all articles of consumption and merchandize. Thus was a company of traders, without responsibility or peculiar fitness for so grave a function, and whose conduct experience proved not to be always influenced either by absolute wisdom or disinterestedness, empowered to entail on the body of the people a plenty or scarcity of the necessities of life, and on the commercial public the most sudden and disastrous vicissitudes.

Our next object will be to give an account of the Bank *profits*, and the enormous wealth it has acquired since the suspension of cash-payments.

The profits of the Bank arise from various sources. First, from the interest of their notes in circulation, which, in some years, as in 1817, amounted to more than twenty-nine millions. Secondly, from balances of public money. These balances arise from the produce of different taxes paid into the Bank, and which have not been drawn out for the service of government. On an average of ten years, from 1806 to 1816, the balances amounted to £11,000,000, on which the Bank gained an interest of five per cent. per annum.

The third source of profit is the interest on their capital and savings. The Bank's permanent capital amounts to £11,686,000, lent to government at an interest of 3 per cent. The fourth source of profit is from the management of the borough debt. From a late act for the management of the debt, the Bank is paid £340 per million per annum, when its amount shall be 400 millions, and not exceed 600 millions: and £300 per million on such part of the debt as exceeds 600 millions.

Besides these sources of profit, the Bank derives a profit from its trade in bullion, the destruction of its notes, and the private deposits of individuals. It also has a profit, at the rate of £805:15:10 per million, for receiving subscriptions on loans contracted for by government.* All these form the gross profits of the Bank; from which, in

* During the continuance of the income-tax, the Bank had an allowance of £1250 per million, or one-eighth per cent. for receiving the produce of that impost. It had also another source of profit from lotteries; for issuing the tickets and paying the prizes it received £1000 for each lottery.

order to form an estimate of their annual gain, it is only necessary to deduct the amount of their expenses, the stamp-duty on their notes, and the interest of their cash and bullion, which constitute their unproductive capital.

First, as to the expenses of the Bank. The Committee of Public Expenditure stated, in their report in 1827, "that the number of " clerks employed in the Bank, exclusively or principally in the public " business was,

" In 1786	243
" 1796	313
" 1807	450

" whose salaries, it is presumed, may be calculated at an average " between £120 and £170, for each clerk, taking them at £135, " which exceeds the average of those employed in the South-Sea " House, the sum is £60,750 " at £150, the sum is 67,500 " at £170, the sum is 76,500 " either of which two last sums would be sufficient to provide a super- " annuation fund."

The total expense for managing the public business, the salaries of the governor, directors, &c. as stated by the same report, are as follows :—

Salaries to governor, deputy-governor, and directors	£8,000
Incidental expenses, about	15,000
Additional buildings and repairs	10,000
Law expenses, and loss by frauds and forgeries, about	10,000
Largest estimate for clerks	76,500

Total..... £119,500

Owing to the increase in the debt and other causes, Mr. Ricardo supposed that the number of clerks employed in the public business had increased from four hundred and fifty to between five and six hundred. The expenses estimated by the committee, in 1807, at £119,500, he calculated to have increased, in 1816, to £150,000. He states, on very good authority, the total number of clerks employed by the Bank, in the whole of their establishment, at one thousand. Half of this number is employed in the public business, and the other half in the private business of the Bank. The expenses of the Company may be supposed to bear some proportion to the whole number of clerks employed. And, according to this rule, Mr. Ricardo says that, "as £150,000 has been calculated to be the expense attending the employment of five hundred clerks in the public business, we may estimate a like expense to be incurred by the employment of the other five hundred, and, therefore the whole expenses of the Bank, at

the present time, about £300,000, including all charges whatsoever."—*Secure and Economical Currency*, p. 71, 2.

This estimate includes every charge: the expense of managing the public business, the salaries of the governor, directors, and clerks; incidental expenses, additional buildings, and repairs; together with law-expenses, loss by frauds, forgeries, and every other expense incurred in conducting the business of the establishment.

The next subject forming a part of the outgoings of the Bank is the stamp-duty. The Bank, till lately, has always been particularly favoured in the composition which they paid for stamp-duties. In 1791 they paid a composition of £12,000 per annum, in lieu of all stamps either on bill or notes. In 1799, on an increase of the stamp-duty, this composition was advanced to £20,000, and an addition of £4000 for notes issued under £5, raised the whole to £24,000. In 1804, an addition of not less than 50 per cent. was made to the stamp-duty; but, although the Bank circulation of notes under £5 had increased from one and a half to four and a half millions, the whole composition was only raised from £24,000 to £32,000. In 1808, there was a further increase of 33 per cent. to the stamp-duty, at which time the composition was raised from £32,000 to £42,000. In both these instances, the increase was not in proportion even to the increase of duty; and no allowance whatever was made for the increase in the amount of the Bank circulation.

It was not till the Session of 1815, on a further increase of the stamp-duty, that the new principle was established, and the Bank compelled to pay a composition in some proportion to the amount of their circulation. The composition is now fixed as follows:—Upon the average circulation of the preceding year, the Bank is to pay at the rate of £3,500 per million, on their aggregate circulation, without reference to the different classes and value of their notes. The establishment of this principle it is calculated caused a saving to the public, in the years 1815 and 1816, of £70,000. By the neglect of this principle, which ought to have been adopted in 1799, Mr. Ricardo estimated the public to have been *losers*, and the Bank consequently *gainers*, of no less a sum than *half a million*.

The last subject for which an allowance is to be deducted from the gross profits of the Bank, is for their unproductive capital, namely, their cash and bullion. At the stoppage in 1797, the Bank stated, in their accounts, laid before parliament, that their cash and bullion, and their bills and notes discounted, together amounted to £4,196,080. They also gave a scale of discounts from 1782, to 1797, and a corresponding scale of the cash and bullion in the Bank for the same period. By comparing these numbers with each other, and some parts of the evidence, Mr. Allardyce discovered the whole secret the Bank wished to conceal—namely, the amount of cash and bullion in their coffers. According to this gentleman's calculation, as before mentioned, the cash and bullion of the Bank, on the 26th February, 1797, was reduced as

low as one million two hundred and seventy-two thousand pounds. Subsequently the Bank increased its stock of cash and bullion; and on the average of the eighteen years, from 1797 to 1815, Mr. Ricardo conjectured it amounted to about three millions.

We have now mentioned all the circumstances necessary to form an estimate of the net profits of the Bank. We have mentioned all the sources whence the gross profits are derived, and also the different items of their disbursements. Proceeding on these principles, Mr. Ricardo calculated the clear gains of the Bank from the time of the suspension of cash payments, in 1797, to the year 1816. The whole of the calculation for each year is inserted at length in the appendix to his "*Proposals for a Secure and Economical Currency.*" We shall only insert his table of the results of his estimate; containing a statement of the surplus capital of the Bank, the yearly gains, and the amount of dividends and bonuses paid to the proprietors of Bank Stock.

Statement of the net Profits of the Bank, and the Amount of Dividends and Bonuses paid to the Proprietors, from the time of the Stoppage in 1797 to 1816.

Year commencing in January.	Surplus capital.	Profits after paying dividends and bonuses.	Dividends and bonuses together
1797	£3,826,890	£ 89,872	7 per cent.
1798	3,916,762	533,621	7 do.
1799	4,450,383	*	17 do.
1800	3,941,228	611,981	7 do.
1801	4,553,209	116,038	12 do.
1802	4,669,247	460,509	9½ do.
1803	5,129,756	765,859	7 do.
1804	5,895,615	306,794	12 do.
1805	6,202,409	346,335	12 do.
1806	6,548,744	368,008	12 do.
1807	6,916,752	581,274	10 do.
1808	7,498,026	385,865	10 do.
1809	7,883,891	470,760	10 do.
1810	8,354,651	651,483	10 do.
1811	9,006,134	722,188	10 do.
1812	9,728,322	739,867	10 do.
1813	10,468,189	809,786	10 do.
1814	11,279,975	1,081,649	10 do.
1815	12,359,624	1,066,625	10 do.
1816	13,426,249		

COLQUHOUN had some reason when he said the Bank was the richest establishment in the world. We here see the amount of its vast profits during twenty years of blood, rapine, and injustice. The ability of the Bank to expend nearly a *quarter of a million* in hanging and transporting their fellow-creatures can no longer excite surprise. We see that the whole of their savings amount to thirteen millions, exclu-

* There was this year a loss of £509,155.

sive of the regular dividend of 10, 12, and as high as 17 per cent. to the proprietors. It is the Bank prize-money, THE SPOIL OF WAR, the clear gains from the loans, lotteries, and taxation of the Pitt and plunder system.

Mr. Ricardo, in calculating the above table, has not included all the sources of Bank profit. He has not included the profit the Bank derives from the destruction of its notes; nor from the private deposits; nor from exchequer bills. These would have swelled their savings still higher. Omitting, however, these items, we see what an enormous fund had been accumulated. This fund, it must be remembered, is *clear gain*, after the payment of the dividends, bonuses, all salaries and expenses. It formed an unappropriated sum, not divided among the proprietors. The Bank, at the conclusion of the war in 1815, could have divided more than one hundred per cent. without encroaching on their permanent capital: in other words, they could have granted £100 to every holder of Bank-stock, to the amount of £100, and yet not encroached on the original capital of the Company. If they made a division of one hundred per cent. bonus, they would still have had an unappropriated income of £542,000, which would have enabled them to increase their permanent dividend from ten to fourteen and a half per cent. If they had divided only a bonus of seventy-five per cent. they would retain a surplus capital exceeding that of 1797, and an unappropriated income of £673,000, which would enable them to raise their dividend from ten to fifteen and a half per cent. If the profits of the Bank had continued, and no addition been made to the present dividend of ten per cent. the accumulation of the surplus profit in forty years, would have given to the Bank a disposable fund of more than *one hundred and twenty millions*.*

According to law, all profits and advantages arising out of the management of the Bank ought to be divided, from time to time, among the proprietors, in proportion to each person's share and interest in the stock of the Company. This law has never been observed by the directors; the concern has been carried on, and no statement of its affairs, nor the surplus savings, have ever been submitted to the proprietors. Mr. Allardyce, in 1801, and subsequently Mr. Young and other proprietors, have attempted at different times to compel the governor and directors to make a declaration of the affairs of the Bank; but these gentlemen appear to have considered it more prudent policy to conceal, as far as possible, their immense gains from the public.

In the Bank Report of the Committee of the House of Lords, in 1819, there is also an estimate of the total profits of the Bank since the Restriction-Act. This estimate, which we shall insert, exhibits at one view the amount of bonuses and increase of dividends to the proprietors; the new stock created, and the increased value of the original capital. It is Mr. Ricardo who is interrogated.

* Ricardo on a Secure and Economical Currency, p. 84.

“Do you believe the following account to be an accurate account of the profits of the Bank since the Restriction, namely,

In bonuses and increase of dividends.....	£7,451,136
New Bank-stock (£2,910,600) divided among the proprietors	7,276,500
Increased value of capital of £11,642,000, (which on an average of 1797, was worth £125, and which is now worth £250,) that is	14,553,000

Making in all, on a capital of £11,642,000, a gain in 19 years of £29,280,636

“I have no reason to doubt it; I believe it is accurate, as far as I recollect.”
—*Minutes of Evidence*, p. 191.

This statement we conceive needs no explanation. In bonuses and an increase of dividends, the Bank has gained £7,451,136. The new Bank-stock created, at £250 per cent. is worth £7,276,500. The original capital of £11,642,000, has increased in value £14,553,000. The total gain of the Bank on a capital of eleven millions, is more than twenty-nine millions. The brief history of the Bank, for nineteen years after the stoppage in 1797, is this: they have hanged and transported about EIGHT HUNDRED PERSONS, and in addition to their old dividend have made a profit of near THREE HUNDRED PER CENT!

There is no establishment which is so deeply interested in the permanence of the borough-system as the Bank of England. It is to the war, commenced by the boroughmongers in 1793, the Bank is indebted for its enormous wealth and inordinate gains. It is to this war the Bank was indebted for the Restriction-Act, which enabled it to raise the circulation of its notes from 12 millions to 30 millions. It was the war, which raised the unredeemed public debt from 220 to 850 millions; of this debt the Bank has had the management, and for which it has received from the public about £300,000 per annum, whereas the receipt on account of the debt in 1792 was only £99,800. It is to the war, too, the Bank was indebted for the increase in the amount of public deposits. In 1792 the deposits were probably less than four millions. In and since 1806, to the peace, they exceeded eleven millions. From this source alone, Mr. Ricardo calculated that, in the ten years from 1806 to 1816, the Bank gained £5,500,000. It is to the war the Bank has been indebted for an annual dividend on its capital to the amount of 10, 12, and in some years as high as 17 per cent. Lastly, the Bank is indebted to the war for clear savings, from the year 1797 to the year 1816, to the enormous amount of £13,426,249.

Should there ever be any thing like an *equitable adjustment*, a refunding or surrendering of surreptitious gains, the Bank will certainly have to yield up the most freely next to the Church and the Aristocracy.

In the year 1800, the charter of the Bank, having then twelve years unexpired, was renewed till the expiration of twelve month's notice to be given after the 1st of August, 1833, and till the payment by the government of the debt and other demands owing to the establishment.

It is to be hoped, however, the Bank charter will not be again re-

newed without an entirely new arrangement far more favourable to the public interests than that now subsisting. The Bank annually receives about £270,000 for its trouble in paying the dividends. It holds balances of public money, free of interest, averaging at least four millions. These balances are employed in discounting bills at the rate of four per cent. yielding a revenue of £160,000, which, being added to the £270,000, makes an annual sum of £430,000 derived from its dealings with the Treasury. This has been always deemed a most extravagant remuneration, and has never been defended even in the House of Commons, except on the groundless plea, that it was binding on the public so long as the present charter had to run.

These do not constitute the whole of the advantages of this long favoured establishment: it enjoys various exclusive privileges in carrying on the trade of banking. By an act of Ann, no corporate body or partnership, consisting of more than *six persons* other than the Bank of England, is allowed to carry on the business of banking. After the panic of 1826, this privilege was so far relaxed as to allow the establishment of banking firms of more than six partners, at places exceeding the *distance of sixty miles* from London; provided such firms had no establishment *as bankers* in the metropolis.

Why should these restrictions be tolerated in favour of an *overgrown* corporation, which has already profited so much by its exclusive immunities? They form, moreover, the chief obstacle to the improvement of the system of banking in both the country and metropolis, by discouraging the establishment of joint-stock associations. Could banking firms be opened in the metropolis with an indefinite number of partners, on the plan of the Scotch banks, their credit would rest on such a sure and extended basis, that they might fairly compete with the establishment in Threadneedle-street for a share of the public business; Government would be relieved from its dependence on a single fraternity; and, in lieu of paying the Bank £270,000 per annum for the payment of the dividends, it is not improbable the whole sum might be saved, and the business transacted for the sake of the profit which might be realized from holding the balances of the public money and unclaimed lottery prizes and dividends.*

The Bank has never conducted its affairs either on such liberal or enlightened principles as to become entitled to peculiar favour from the community. Notwithstanding the enormous profits of this great corporation, it has constantly manifested an eagerness for gain, and impatience for the profitable employment of its capital, which could hardly have been exceeded by a private establishment. In 1822, with a view of extending their discount, they lowered the rate of interest from five to four per cent., and extended the term of discount from sixty to ninety days. In 1823, they contracted for a portion of the dead-weight annuity, by imposing upon themselves the obligation of advancing an

* Memorial of Country Bankers, addressed to the Lords of the Treasury, May 9, 1828.—Parliamentary Paper, No. 328, Sess. 1828.

annual loan for several years; which engagement was clearly at variance with the legitimate principles of banking. At the close of the same year, they announced their intention to lend money on mortgage, which was a deviation from one of their oldest established rules. Lastly, in 1825, they came forward with a proposition to lend money on government securities, and upon their own stock.

By these expedients they were enabled greatly to extend the circulation of their notes; but their resources, contrary to all sound maxims, were tied up in inconvertible securities, so that they were less able to discharge their proper functions as bankers. What was worse, the greedy example was followed by the country bankers; and thus the race commenced between them, which could push out the most paper, till they brought upon the country the disastrous mercantile revulsion of 1825-6.

We subjoin a statement of the affairs of the Bank as they are supposed to have stood at the last meeting of the proprietors in September, 1830. It is not official, and must be taken merely as a conjectural approximation on a subject of mystery which the Directors seem resolved shall not be elucidated by any authentic disclosures emanating from them.

DEBTOR.		CREDITOR.	
Circulation of notes.....	£18,500,000	Value of dead-weight annuity, £585,740 per annum, to expire 5th April, 1867, at 19 years purchase	£11,129,360
Public and private balances	9,500,000	Bills discounted	1,500,000
Capital	14,608,500	Mortgages	1,300,000
	42,608,500	Exchequer bills	6,000,000
Balance	2,007,660	Stock purchased.....	600,000
		Advances to various public companies	900,000
		Lent to government	14,686,800
		Gold and silver	8,000,000
		Deficiency Bills, at the period of the quarter ..	500,000
	<u>£44,616,160</u>		<u>£44,616,160</u>

Thus showing a balance of £2,007,660 of undivided profits, exclusive of the value of their buildings, branch-banks, offices, &c.

PLACES, PENSIONS, SINECURES,
REVERSIONS, HALF-PAY,
AND
SUPERANNUATIONS.

So far we have penetrated into the recesses of the Oligarchy! Our first entrance was into HOLY CHURCH, passing, with fear and trembling, through the venerable cathedrals, the collegiate establishments, the stalls, chapters, cloisters, and parsonages—glancing, as we proceeded, at the lawn sleeves, silk aprons, shovel-hats, surplices, hat-bands, and gloves. Next, we ventured into the precincts of royalty, surveying the pomp and gorgeous pageants of courts and palaces; loitering, as we went along, in the pleasant retreats, in the woods and forests, the manors, chases, and crown-lands; afterwards, we entered the domains of feudality, looking over the inheritances and possessions of the Percys, the Wentworths, Cavendishes, Pelhams, and other lords of the soil. Next, we plunged into the rookery among the wigs and gowns, the owls and owlets of Westminster; passing over thence into the treasury, the exchequer, and admiralty; and, finally, concluding our exploratory researches in the purlieu of Leadenhall and Threadneedle-street.

After all this long and devious tour, without mentioning sundry off-sets and ramblings by the way, our readers, we fear, are only yet imperfectly acquainted with the Borough System; they comprehend only its geography—its general departments and divisions—and know nothing of the various *living creatures*—the birds and beasts, and creeping things it contains. Our next object, therefore, will be, to introduce them into the *menagerie* of placemen, pensioners, sinecurists, reversionists, compensationists, superannuationists, and what not; first, describing their classes, genera, and species; and, afterwards, concluding with a catalogue of their names and qualities. This department of our work will be found a museum of rarities, embracing every link in the human creation, every description of men, women, and children. Like the ark of Noah, there has been nothing too great or mean in nature to find admission. It exhibits all the vice, the caprice, and injustice, of aristocratic government: the highest services to the state almost without

notice, and the greatest gifts of the Crown lavished on profligacy, servility, and intrigue. It exhibits indolence and luxury devouring the bread for which poverty and industry have toiled, and for which they are now starving. It exhibits the strength, arcana, and machinery of the English government. It is a real picture of our boasted constitution—if not by law, as by practice established; and is a source whence a foreigner may draw far more correct notions of the checks, balances, and supports of the system, than from the visionary and panegyrical descriptions of Blackstone and De Lolme.

Before giving a list of the public cormorants, let us briefly describe their orders and degrees, beginning with the host of placemen filling the public offices.

From returns to parliament, it appears there are 22,912 persons employed in the public departments, whose salaries amount to £2,788,907.* This does not include the immense number of persons employed in courts of law, the royal household, nor the colonies, and which, if included, would almost double the number of functionaries and their emoluments. The following exhibits a statement of the principal branches of revenue, in which this vast army of tax-gatherers and collectors is distributed, and a comparison of their relative numbers and emoluments in 1797 and 1827.

Offices.	YEAR 1797.		YEAR 1827.	
	No. of Persons.	Salaries.	No. of Persons.	Salaries.
Customs....United Kingdom....	6,004† ..	£338,648 11,346 ..	£964,750
ExciseDitto	6,580413,281 6,491768,795
StampsDitto	521 78,746 519134,065
Taxes.....Ditto	291 58,331 347 74,190
Post-Office .Great Britain	957 54,030 1,377 85,970
DittoIreland	153 9,278 333 21,961

An important consideration is the comparative remuneration of placemen in 1797 and at present. In the year 1797 there were 16,267 persons employed in the public departments; and they received £1,374,561 a year. In 1827 there were 22,912 persons, and they received £2,788,907: the average income of each individual was £84 in 1797, and about £121 in 1827, being at the rate of *thirty-three per cent.* increase of salary.

Now, can any just cause be assigned, why the whole mass of salaries should not be reduced to the rate of 1797, thereby effecting a

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 552, Session 1828.

† The Custom returns for this year are incorrect, owing to the returns for the Port of London having been destroyed by fire in 1814. The persons employed in the Port of London, in 1815, were 2,043. The return of the amount of salaries, at the two periods, is accurate. To obviate another objection, it must be observed, that in 1806-7, and 18, fees to the annual amount of £40,000 were abolished, and equivalent salaries substituted. This, however, accounts only for a very small part of the enormous increase in the charge of this department.

saving of upwards of one-third in an expenditure of £2,788,907 per annum. All the reasons which have ever been alleged for an augmentation in the pay of public servants have ceased to exist. The price of wheat in 1797 and in 1830 is nearly the same; at least there is no material variation, and the value of the currency has been restored. How much better circumstanced are placemen now than in 1810; in that year there were 22,931 persons receiving £2,822,727, averaging about the same income as in 1827: but, at the former period, wheat was 105s. a quarter; while, at present, it is 60s. a quarter. Why should those who live on the taxes enjoy such advantages over those who pay them? Rents, profits, wages, every description of income, the produce of industry and capital, has fallen at least one-third since 1810, and why should not those who are paid by the public be compelled to retrench in an equal ratio? Do not let a suffering community be insulted by the declaration, that there is no *room for retrenchment*—that it has already been carried to the utmost limit. Here is the proof to the contrary; here it is shewn that, without the least injustice to individuals, in the single item of SALARIES, one million per annum might be saved, which is nearly equal to the produce of the window-duties, and more than double the produce of all the taxes on newspapers, advertisements, and knowledge!

After all, it is not the clerks—the mere underlings of office—that we wish to see exclusively curtailed; it is the vultures of the system whom we wish to see scotched—the chairmen of boards—the commissioners of stamps, of the excise, the customs, and assessed taxes—the secretaries of state—the lords of the treasury—the lords of the admiralty—the president of the council—the great officers of the king's household—the lord privy-seal—the judges, masters, registrars, and secretaries of bankrupt in the courts of law—the receivers of taxes—the comptrollers, paymasters, treasurers, solicitors of taxes, and prothonotaries: it is these, the great birds of prey, whom we first wish to be brought down, and then the inferior race may be pounced upon.

The increase in salaries is not confined to civil offices, it extends equally to military, naval, and ordnance pay and allowances. In all these branches of service, there has been a great augmentation in consequence of the rise in the price of provisions, which is a reason that can be no longer urged against reduction. In 1792, the pay of a private soldier in the regular infantry was only £9 : 2 : 6 for 365 days; it is now £18 : 5. The pay of the regular cavalry has been increased in the same proportion. The pay of a commander in the navy, in 1792, was 20s. per diem; in 1829, 60s. per diem. The allowance to the widow of a colonel, in 1792, was £50 per annum; in 1827, £90 per annum.* A similar scale of augmentation has been applied to almost every other class; but the time has arrived when they ought all to be reduced to the rate before the war. The productive orders of society have long since been compelled to retrograde, and those who live on the produce of their industry must follow them. While the tide was

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 594, Session 1830.

at flood all officers and placemen were wafted too high on the beach; now the tide has fallen, they must either voluntarily glide or supinely wait to be forced into the common channel.

CIVIL AND MILITARY PLURALITIES.—One of the greatest abuses in the public service is pluralities. When a single individual can adequately discharge the duties of half a dozen different offices the duties of these offices must be either very small or unimportant, and consequently some of them might either be abolished or consolidated, and the salaries saved or reduced. A few examples of this abuse may not be uninteresting. Lord Cathcart receives a pension of £2000 a-year as late ambassador; he is Vice-Admiral of Scotland (a sinecure); besides his military pay and allowances as a general officer and colonel of a regiment of life-guards. The Earl of Rosslyn is Lord Privy Seal of England, and Chancellor for Scotland, (a sinecure) with good salaries with each, together with his large military pay, allowances, &c. Lord Melville was, lately, first Lord of the Admiralty, £5000 a-year, and Keeper of the Privy Seal for Scotland (a sinecure) £2675 a-year. To these we subjoin a few other examples of pluralities as they stood at the latest period of the Duke of Wellington's administration; we do not cite them as peculiarly illustrative of the Duke's ministry; similar abuses existed under his predecessors as they will under those who have succeeded him, till there is a parliamentary reform. They are taken from the *Parl. Paper*, No. 479, Session 1830, with a correction or two from the Annual Finance Accounts.

	£	s.	d.
<i>Lord Ellenborough</i> ; President of the Board of Controul	5000	0	0
Chief Clerk of Court of King's Bench	9625	8	1
Custom Brevium of the King's Bench; an office held jointly with Lord Kenyon, who receives the emoluments during his life.			
<i>Lord Beresford</i> ; Master General of the Ordnance	3175	18	4
Captain of the Cadet Company	469	0	0
Colonel of the 16th regiment of Foot	1173	2	6
Pension.....	2000	0	0
Governor of Jersey; paid out of tithes, rents, &c. in 1828.....	1100	0	0
<i>Duke of Wellington</i> ; First Lord of the Treasury.....	5000	0	0
Field Marshal	Nil		
Colonel in Chief of the Rifle Brigade	238	15	5
Colonel of the 1st regiment of Foot Guards	2695	0	0
Constable of the Tower	950	0	0
Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports	295	13	7
Commissioner for the Affairs of India.....	No salary		
Pension out of Consolidated Fund.....	4000	0	0
<i>Sir George Cockburn</i> ; Lord of the Admiralty	1000	0	0
Vice-Admiral of the White	1573	0	0
Major-General of Marines	1037	0	0
<i>Lieutenant-General Sir Herbert Taylor</i> ; Adjutant-General	1383	19	2

Allowance	£500 0 0
Pay and emoluments as Colonel of the 85th Foot	948 8 11
Principal Aide-de-Camp to the King	
Private Secretary to the King.....	
Pension, April, 1819.....	933 0 0
<i>Lord Hill</i> ; General Commanding-in-Chief	3458 0 0
Colonel of the 53d regiment.....	1358 14 6
Pension	2000 0 0
Governor of Hull	617 15 10

Abundant other examples of similar enormity will be found on reference to the *List of Places*.

HALF-PAY AND SUPERANNUATIONS.

The sums expended under the head of "*Dead Weight*," consisting of retired full-pay, half-pay, civil superannuations, and allowances to the army and navy, is equal to the revenue of many powerful states. The number of military officers, on full-pay, is 6,173: the number of military officers on half-pay, is 6,009. In the navy, there are 5,528 officers; of this number, 200 are admirals, of whom only *ten are in actual service*; 803 are captains, of whom only seventy-nine are employed; 836 are commanders, of whom only seventy are employed; and 3,689 are lieutenants, of whom only 669 are employed. The total sum annually paid in retired full-pay, half-pay, superannuations, pensions, and allowances to officers in the army and ordnance; to militia-adjutants, local-militia-adjutants, and serjeant-majors; to foreigners on half-pay, and to foreigners receiving pensions, &c. is £3,314,639:17:7.* The total sum annually payable under similar heads in the navy, is £1,583,797:16:10. The *Dead Weight* altogether, including the superannuations, grants, and pensions, in the Metropolitan Police, Excise, Customs, Treasury, Stamp, Tax Offices, Revenue, and Military Boards, is £5,363,640:7:11½.†

Such, in addition to the public debt of eight hundred millions, and the conflagrations in the home counties, is the fatal bequest of aristocratic government; of that government which vainly sought to avert domestic reform by foreign war and intervention!

There is, however, something so peculiar in the *Dead Weight*, that it deserves more particular investigation. It might have been thought, during a period of peace and reduced establishments, and more especially by the deaths of annuitants, that the burthen imposed on the community under this head would have been lightened. But it is not so; the *Dead Weight* is too good a thing for the Aristocracy to be suffered to expire, and it seems likely to be, at least, co-existent with the system which created it. In 1822, this precious entail of the Borough-mongers war expenditure amounted to £5,289,087,‡ which is less, by £74,553 per annum, than it was in March, 1830. All the time go-

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 185, Session 1830. † Ibid. page 5.

‡ Parliamentary Paper, No. 424, Session 1826.

vernment has been loud and unceasing in professions of economy, of a desire to reduce every possible charge,—to make every possible saving; yet, in face of all this, one great and most objectionable branch of expense, under circumstances most favourable for reduction, has been actually suffered to increase!

What faith can the nation repose in the declarations of any ministers? They can only be meant to deceive—to *prolong time*—to lull a suffering people into a fatal security. All the extravagance of which we complain has resulted from a negligent—not to say deliberate—and indefensible system of profusion. We do not complain of the expense of maintaining those who are actually worn-out or disabled in the public service, no more than we complain of supporting, by a poor-rate, the aged and infirm in civil life; but we may justly complain of supporting those who are in health and strength,—who never served their country, and have no claim on its gratitude. The half-pay of the Army and Navy, on the present plan, is decidedly objectionable. It is not a *remuneration for past service*; since every holder of a commission, though he has held it only for a day or an hour, is as much entitled to claim half-pay, when not actually employed, as another who has served for twenty years. Such being the rule of the service, ought not government to have adopted every precaution against the multiplication of claimants; ought it not have guarded against *new* admissions into the naval and military departments, while there remained officers in abundance on half-pay able to fill up every vacancy? Their conduct has been the reverse of so obvious a principle. Thousands of new commissions have been given away in the Army and Navy, while, at the same time, we had upwards of 16,000 officers in both branches of service totally unemployed. Hence the *perpetuity of the Dead Weight*. The Aristocracy look upon the Army, the Navy, the Church, and Public Offices, as so many branches of their patrimony, and that a reduction in them would lessen the amount of patronage, diminish the funds for the maintenance of younger children, illegitimate offspring, collateral relatives, favourites, and dependents.

Besides the granting of first commissions, other causes have operated to keep up the amount of the Dead Weight. Previous to the year 1820, no half-pay was payable to officers holding any other office, civil or military, under the crown; but this regulation did not extend to officers on *full-pay*, the receipt of which was compatible with the holding of civil employment. Another regulation, previous to 1818, was that widows should not be allowed pensions, unless their husbands had been on full pay; and all widows having pensions ceased to receive them if they married. Further, in the Navy, a widow lost her pension if her income from any other source equalled twice its amount. All these regulations have been abrogated;* and the consequence has been an annual increase of charge to the amount of £147,624; and a loss to the public from 1818 of upwards of £1,300,000.

* Third Report of the Committee on Public Income and Expenditure, Parliamentary Papers, vol. v. Session 1828.

What we have said will, we apprehend, be sufficient to enable our readers to comprehend the nature of the Dead Weight, and the causes of its longevity. We shall proceed with other subjects, first referring to the *Appendix* for a more detailed statement of the Half-Pay and Superannuation Expenditure.

SINECURES, REVERSIONS, AND PENSIONS.

Sinecures are offices without employment! The bare description is sufficient to decide the fate of appointments like these; but how infatuated the government must be, which obstinately retains them amidst a discontented and famishing population. Let us shortly inquire into the origin and present state of these corruptions.

Sinecures have mostly originated from changes in the usages of society, from alterations in the management of the revenue, the administration of justice, and partly from the union of the three kingdoms. They ought all to have ceased with the duties attached to them; but have been kept up for sake of patronage. Of the first description of sinecures, the office of master of the hawks, in the royal household, held, with a salary of £1,392, by the Duke of St. Albans, is an example. The chief-justices in Eyre, with salaries amounting to £4,566, have been kept up for centuries, after such a mode of administering the laws had terminated. In Scotland and Ireland is a host of offices of which the holders, without employment or responsibility, have only to receive their salaries and emoluments. Of this class are the offices of Vice-admiral of Scotland, held by *general* Lord Cathcart; the Keeper of the Privy Seal of Scotland, held by the late first Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Melville; the office of Chancellor of Scotland, held by lieutenant-general the Earl of Rosslyn; the office of Justice-general of Scotland, held by the late Master of the Horse, the Duke of Montrose; and the office of Keeper of the Signet in Ireland, held by Lord Colchester. All these are absolute sinecures, with salaries varying from £1500 to £5000 per annum. The offices of Chief Justices-in-Eyre, now held by Lord Clarendon and the Right Honourable T. Grenville, are to cease with *existing interests*; but when that will be no one can tell, since many of these lucrative appointments have been made *hereditary* in particular families, or patent offices granted for a long term of years.

Next to absolute sinecures are offices of which the salaries are vastly disproportioned to the employment, and of which the duties are discharged wholly by *deputy*. This forms a very numerous class. As specimens may be mentioned, the Auditorship of the Exchequer, held by Lord Grenville, with a salary of £4000; the Registrarship of the Admiralty, held by Lord Arden, with an income of £10,500; the four Tellerships of the Exchequer, each with salaries of £2700; and the four Clerkships of the Pells, with salaries of £1500, held by the Bathursts, Dundasses, and Percivals. In the departments of the Army, the Navy, and Revenue, are numerous sinecures, which ought to have been long since extinguished. Such are the Paymaster of the Forces, £2000;

the Treasurership of the Navy, £3000; the Vice-Treasurership for Ireland, £2000; the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, £2000; and the Master-General of the Ordnance, £3175; the duties of which last office, if any, might be discharged by the Lieutenant-General of the Ordnance.

Many offices in courts of justice fall under this head. Only think of Earl Bathurst being a clerk in Chancery, with a salary of £1108, and of such a pompous man as Lord Ellenborough, being Clerk of the Court of King's Bench, with a salary of £9625, and one of the *custodes brevium* of the same court. The Honourable Thomas Kenyon, a brother of Lord Kenyon, is filazer, clerk of outlawries and custos, with emoluments amounting to £7,000 or £8,000 a year. The emoluments of Mr. Thomas Thurlow, the patentee for the execution of the bankrupt laws, amounted, in the year ending January 1830, to £8,502; and the emoluments of the *Rev.* Thomas Thurlow, (another relative of the Chancellor of that name,) as clerk of the hanaper, averaged betwixt £2,000 and 3,000 per annum.* The Scotts, the Surtees, the Abbots, the Murrays, and other well-known names, hold valuable appointments in courts of law; but we cannot stop to particularise them, and must refer to the *List of Places*. In the counties palatine and duchy courts of Lancaster, Durham, Chester, and Cornwall, are innumerable sinecures in the nominal capacities of chancellors, registrars, receivers, attorneys and solicitors general, auditors, King's counsel, ushers, and other mimicry of the regal and imperial government.

Again, what a host of sinecures, under the titles of governors, lieutenant-governors, town-adjutants, town-majors, constables, gunners, wardens, lord-wardens, and God knows what beside, of the cities, towns, forts, castles, garrisons, &c. of Great Britain and Ireland. Berwick-on-Tweed, Chester, Hull, Blackness-Castle, Dover-Castle, Edinburgh-Castle, Walmer-Castle, and Tilbury-Fort, are examples of these appointments, and which cost the country upwards of £35,000 per annum.† Numerous commissioners of revenue, comptrollers, receivers of taxes, and distributors of stamps, are little more than sinecurists, the duties, where any exist, being discharged by deputies. But the chief *nidus* of sinecures is in the colonies. The duties of nearly all offices in the West Indies are discharged by *deputy*, while the principal resides in England. They form an immense branch of patronage to the crown. It is impossible to estimate correctly their total value, the incomes being paid in fees, received by the deputy, who stipulates to pay a fixed annual sum to the principal. The total value of colonial sinecures, exclusive of those at the Cape of Good Hope, the Isle of France, and Malta, has been estimated at £76,546.

The subjoined statement, taken from the Supplementary Report of the Committee of Public Expenditure in 1809, shews the *net* value of the principal sinecures in the gift of the Crown, and otherwise. It is now twenty-one years since this report was made; and, during

* Parliamentary Paper, ordered to be printed Nov. 12, 1830.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 426, Session 1826.

that long interval, we doubt whether the profits of a single sinecure have been saved to the public; some which we have noticed are to cease on the termination of existing interests. In Scotland, last Session, the office of justice-general, and one or two more, were abolished; but then the holders are to have *compensations*; so that, we repeat, we doubt whether, by the extinction of sinecures the community has been saved a farthing; and this monstrous abuse is just as flagrant as ever, to the everlasting reproach of the members of both houses of Parliament, who have not raised their voice, not only once but many times, against the further toleration of this shameless robbery, under any shape or pretext. Here is the return to which we have referred:—

Sinecures in the English Law Courts, mostly in the gift of the Judges.....	£ 62,462
Sinecures in England, not in Law Courts.....	115,589
Ditto in Scotland.....	25,523
Ditto in Ireland.....	76,435
To which add Colonial Sinecures	76,546
	<hr/> £356,555 <hr/>

Having spoken of Sinecures, we come next to their natural offspring—*Reversions*. It was very natural that the holders of situations, to which large emoluments and no duties were attached, should not only wish to preserve them during their lives, but also, if possible, transmit them to their relatives and friends after death: hence originated grants in reversion. Another reason, however, may be assigned; ministers not having situations in sufficient abundance to satisfy all their adherents, endeavoured to satisfy them by anticipation. Those for whom they could not immediately provide, they satisfied by obtaining grants from the king, making them the *heirs* of places at the death of the present possessors. Sometimes these reversions were granted to two or three persons at once; first to one, and if *he* or *she* should die, to *another*; and if he or she should die, to another: in this way have been granted most of the places on the Irish establishment for sixty or seventy years to come.

The absurdity of this practice is sufficiently obvious. Nothing could be more ridiculous than to appoint persons to offices who were, perhaps, yet in the nursery, and of whose future capabilities it was impossible to have any knowledge. To be sure, many of these reversionary situations had no duties attached to them, and, of course, it could not be of much importance by whom they were discharged.

From the large emoluments of Sinecures, and the granting them in reversion, have originated some ludicrous incongruities. Many noble lords and their sons, right honourable and honourable gentlemen, fill the offices of clerks, tide-waiters, harbour-masters, searchers, gaugers, packers, craners, wharfingers, prothonotaries, and other degrading situations. Some of these offices are filled by women and some by children. Not long since a right honourable lady, a Baroness, was *sweeper* of the Mall in the Park; another lady was *chief usher* in the Court of Exchequer; and the Honourable Louisa Browning and Lady B.

Martyn, were *custos brevium*: some of these offices, we see, from the *Law List*, have been recently merged in and executed by the husbands and children of these *high-born* dames. Then of noble Lords; the Beresfords hold the appropriate offices of *wine-tasters*, *storekeepers*, *packers*, and *craners*, in Ireland; the Duke of Grafton, with a deputy to help, is *sealer* in the Common Pleas in England, at £3888 a year; Lord Walsingham is in the petty office of comptroller of first-fruits in the Court of Exchequer; and Lord Wm. Bentinck, now located in India as governor-general of Bengal, is clerk of the pipe, part of whose office it is to attend or assist the man who holds up Lord Chancellor Brougham's train.

We could enumerate a great many more, but they will be noticed in our List; we shall pass on to Pensions.

As nearly as can be collected from the various official returns submitted to Parliament, it would appear there are upwards of fifteen hundred pensioners, who receive about £777,556 per annum. This is exclusive of colonial pensions, and of all grants, allowances, half-pay, and superannuations for civil, military, and naval services. We subjoin a statement of the objects and sources from which this vast sum is paid.

Pensions payable out of the consolidated fund of England and Ireland.....	£ 455,444
Pensions payable out of the hereditary revenues of the Post Office and Excise	22,439
Pensions to American loyalists	5,056
Pensions to Toulonese and Corsican emigrants	14,380
Pensions to St. Domingo sufferers and Dutch naval officers.....	1,820
Pensions to ambassadors and other foreign ministers charged on the civil list.....	57,377*
Court pensions limited, by 22d Geo. III. c. 82, to.....	95,000
Pensions on the Irish civil list, about	75,000
Ditto on the Scotch civil list.....	35,000
Ditto to Spanish refugees, who had co-operated with the British armies in the Peninsula war	18,040†
Total of Pensions.....	<u>£777,556</u>

The funds, out of which pensions are paid, are so numerous that we are not sure, though we have all the official returns about us, some of them have not escaped our researches. However, we had rather be under the mark than be accused of exaggeration. Exclusive of sinecures, and the millions expended on objects nearly as unjustifiable,

* This and the preceding items are taken from the Fourth Report of Sir H. Parnell's Finance Committee, page 67, Session 1828.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 127, Session 1830. This item, perhaps, ought to be omitted, being only, we presume, a temporary allowance to individuals, many of whom had just claims on the hospitality of the country.

a pension roll, in times like these, to the amount of £777,556, is enough to make a man start from his seat, especially if he reflect, for one moment, on the dreadful state of the labouring population of the empire. In our humble opinion the salaries of public servants ought to be their only reward, and the granting of pensions is altogether unjustifiable, unless for casualties in the service of the country; but when they are squandered on persons of whom the public knows nothing, nor for what, they are an unbearable grievance. Who, for instance, knows any thing of the services of the Giffords, the Cockburns, the Selwyns, the Piersons, the Napiers, and scores more, who are living on the earnings of the industrious. Foreigners, too, are on the Pension List; men have been brought from all parts of the earth, from America, from Germany, from France, and myriads from Scotland; to eat our bread, and devour the wages of labour and the profits of trade and agriculture.

It would be quite impossible, within reasonable limits, to enter into an analysis of the Pension List; but there is one class of pensioners who have got upon our backs in such a peculiar way, and they have such peculiar claims on national gratitude, that we must needs crave the reader's patience while we shortly describe their origin and pretensions.

In the year 1817, there was a pretty general call for retrenchment, and a Select Committee of Finance, consisting mostly of placemen and pensioners, recommended as a sort of tub to the whale, the abolition of a few of the more obnoxious sinecures. Three acts were accordingly introduced to abolish certain useless offices; as supervisor of his Majesty's printing-press, compiler of the Dublin gazette, master of the revels, chief justices in Eyre, clerk of the pipe, receiver of the bishop's rents, and some others were to be abolished: all which are subject to *existing interests*. But mark the sequel: having recommended the abolition of these sinecures, the committee next recommend the creation of others; having cut down the places without any duties to perform, they create so many new pensions of retirement and superannuations, as actually to entail a greater burthen on the country after this mock retrenchment than before!

With this view, the 57th Geo. III. c. 65, was introduced. The act begins by reciting that, "the abolition and regulation of various offices, which deprive the crown of *part of the means* by which his Majesty has been heretofore enabled to recompense the service of persons who have held *high and efficient civil offices*;" and it modestly enacts, that, from thenceforth and evermore, all the high and low "*efficient public officers*" of the country, from the first lord of the treasury down to the secretaries of the treasury, under secretaries of state, clerk of the ordnance, first and second secretaries of the Admiralty, all included, shall be supported by pensions paid out of the pockets of the people. This was reforming with a vengeance! A committee, appointed expressly to abolish useless places, finishes by recommending the *purchase* of them, and the establishing of a perpetual fund to reward the holders

thereof; most of the members of the committee themselves being the parties to be benefited by this admirable mode of retrenchment.

This truly extraordinary Pension Act assumes, as a principle, that the different sinecures are the absolute property of our hereditary legislators and their dependents; and thence concludes, because these offices are abolished, they have a claim to be provided for in some other way. "Here is a considerable mass of property," they say, "taken from our grasp, and it must be made up to us by equivalent pensions." This is exactly the principle, and what must the constitution of the government be which sanctions, by its authority, so monstrous an assumption?

What right had these "high and efficient public men" to compensation at all? The sinecures were *abuses*, and they ought to have been swept away without equivalent. If other classes are injured by reform or improvement, what compensation do they receive for their loss? The workman suffers by the substitution of machinery, the merchant and manufacturer by the vicissitudes of commerce, and the farmer by alterations of the currency; but they receive no equivalent; no fund is provided to make up the loss of their capital and industry. How many individuals have been ruined by the introduction of the *steam-engine*; yet no one thinks of making up the loss of the sufferers. No one thinks of establishing a perpetual fund to compensate the loss of the stocking-weavers, printers, cloth-dressers, or coach proprietors: no one would think of compensating the loss of the publicans and brewers, from the throwing open the *beer trade*. Yet the rights of all these classes are as sacred as those of the pensioners and sinecurists. They have all *vested interests* in their pursuits; they have all served apprenticeships or laid out their capital: and if the sacrifice of their property be a public good, they are as much entitled to compensation as the "high and efficient public men."

Absurd as the principle is, it pervades the whole system: all abuses are *private property*, and you cannot reform them without raising an outcry that the interests of some class or other is violated. If you meddle with tithe, you are violating the property of the church. If you attempt reform in courts of justice, you are attacking the emoluments and patronage of the judicial classes. If you attack the rotten boroughs, you are accused of invading the property of the aristocracy. And, lastly, if you touch sinecures, they are the property of our "*high and efficient public*" men.

Under such a system there can be *no reform*; there can be only transformation of abuse; you can only transmute a sinecure into a pension, or an enormous salary into a superannuation; but, as to extirpating the evil altogether, it is chimerical. That can only be done by a reformed Parliament, which shall have no vested interests in the abuses it undertakes to remove.

Having explained the origin and principle of the Pension Act, let us next glance at some of the worthies who, up to this time, under the designation of "high and efficient public men," have fastened their

greedy talons on the earnings of the industrious. First on the list is Lord Sidmouth, £3000 a year for life; his lordship, besides, has Richmond-park Lodge, and for many years has been receiving, as deputy-ranger, from £1000 to £2000 per annum, out of the rents and profits of the crown lands. The sinecure of clerk of the Pells, was many years held by his son; and there are several other Addingtons in the church and on foreign missions. Altogether £5000 a year may be put down as the reward of the famous circular, the memorable *letter of thanks*, to the Manchester magistrates, for the massacre of the 16th of August, and other high and efficient public services of Henry Viscount Sidmouth.

The next is the honourable Robert Ward £1000, the auditor of the civil list, we believe, and who has run through various ranks and degrees as clerk of the Ordnance, M.P. for Haslemere, &c. This gentleman is only to receive half his pension, if he hold office of less annual value than twice its amount.

The right honourable Henry Goulbourn £2000, the Duke's luminous and most efficient chancellor of the Exchequer. Then follows a Mr. Hamilton £1000, of whom we know nothing, unless he be a late consul or clerk of the Treasury. Afterwards we have Thomas Peregrine Courtenay, M.P. for Totness, colonial agent for the Cape of Good Hope, and late secretary of the India Board. This is the "family man," with a wife and fourteen children, for whom Mr. Canning once made so melting an appeal to the guardians of the public purse;—they must be provided for. Mr. Courtenay is the cousin of a peer—let him be put down for £1000, and his sons have the first vacancies in the Mint, the Treasury, or Exchequer!

Now, right honourable John Wilson Croker, come forth; don't be ashamed; who can begrudge any thing to the paymaster of the widow's charity, and a twenty-one years' secretary of the Admiralty, with £3000 per annum. Put John down for £1500 a year for life—but stop; do not let him receive his pension, no more than his brother pamphleteer, Peregrine Courtenay, if he hold offices yielding £3000 a year.

Joseph Planta, Esq. we congratulate you; enrolled among the high and efficient public men; a secretary of the Treasury, with £3500 a year, and a pension for life of £1000 a year. Mr. Planta, you are a happy man; your calling and election are sure, and you are now placed beyond the risk of accident, by "flood or field." Next to Castor and Pollux, whom you have so good a right to follow, you have been one of the most humble and industrious labourers in the borough vineyard.

We pass over Canning and Huskisson; at the time of their death, each was down for £3000; they were among the most greedy and audacious of corruptionists; but they are gone to their audit elsewhere;—not, however, without leaving long trails of calamities behind, of which more hereafter.

Next is a Hobhouse £1000; but we pass over him also to come to the last and greatest of our "high and efficient public men," the right

honourable Lord Bexley. How ought a statesman like this to be rewarded; the great, *Sieur Vansittart*, the steadfast coadjutor of the "Thunderer," the astounding financier, the man of infinite resource, who, in the period of our greatest tribulations, did, by the mere force of native genius, make a pound note and a shilling equal to a guinea, when the former was depreciated thirty per cent. Put Nicholas down for £3000 a year for life, and make him a Lord!

Here ends our muster-roll! There are other names; but these are enough to illustrate the application of the Pension Act of 1817, and the supplementary act to it in 1825, and which acts, if not speedily repealed by the Whig ministry, we shall say they are no "true men."

There is another description of pensioners whom we must shortly touch—the noble and learned lords on the woollsacks:—Here is Lord Eldon still preying upon us, at the rate of £4000 a year. Surely £15,000 a year, and upwards, for more than a quarter of a century, and a disposition naturally parsimonious, afforded the means of making a comfortable provision for old age. Lord Lyndhurst, too, is now fastened on us for £4000 for a pretty long term, according to external appearances; and, in a few months, we may expect he will be followed by Lord Brougham. Are these things never to have an end? At this rate the whole Bar may file through the chancellorship, and come upon us, after a quarter's service, for pensions for life, each of which, at the present rate of labourers' wages, would maintain eight hundred persons.

COMPENSATIONS AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES.

A most indefensible principle has long been acted upon by the Government,—namely, if a person has only once been so fortunate as to have had the fingering of the public money, he shall for ever after be supported out of the public purse. It is exactly the principle of the poor-laws; let a man obtain a settlement, and he thenceforward claims subsistence from the parish, and let a placeman once get into a government office, and he immediately, and for ever, sets up the pauper's claim of being fed and clothed at the charge of the community.

Exactly upon this principle was framed the infamous Act of 1817; most of the pensions, we have seen, were granted conditionally; provided the parties were not *in office*, then they should receive their £1000, £1500, or £3000 per annum, as a trifling allowance, to keep the poor creatures from starving while unemployed! What a pity such old and faithful servants should perish of hunger, especially as they could not possibly have had an opportunity, from the lowness of their wages, to lay up a store for a rainy day! Still we like even-handed justice to all mankind. Many object to that mode of administering the poor-laws, which allows a labourer in health and strength his parish-pay, merely because he happens to be *out of work*. But why not extend the same rule to state paupers? Why should such able-bodied men as Croker, Planta, and Courtenay entail upon us such dreadful heavy rates, merely because they are just now in want of a job?

The practice of granting compensations and retiring allowances is just as indefensible as granting pensions. We have now before us two official returns of last session, the bare titles of which are enough to make one sick: one is—"Returns of all Persons who receive Compensation Allowances for the loss of their Offices until *otherwise provided for*;" the other a "Return of the Number of Clerks and Officers who have been SUPERANNUATED, and who have been *again introduced into the service*."

What practices are these? on what principle can they be justified? A merchant or banker retires from business, reduces his establishment, or is forced into the *Gazette*, by alterations in the currency, or commercial vicissitudes, and what compensation does he give to his clerks and servants thrown out of employment? None: nor do they expect any, having previously received salaries equivalent to the value of their services. Let us revert to our former illustration; suppose that, by the discovery of a new machine, a certain manufacture can be carried on at a cheaper rate, and, of course, the public be benefited by its substitution for manual labour, owing to the less price at which they could obtain the manufactured article. Again; suppose that, by some new mode of managing the business of government, a number of offices may be abolished, and, of course, their salaries saved to the community. Here, then, are two cases exactly similar; in one, a number of working people are thrown out of employment; and, in the other, a number of the officers of government. The public is benefited alike in both cases: in one, by saving of salaries; and, in the other, by the less price at which it purchases commodities. But how differently these two classes of sufferers have been treated. One receives a pension or compensation, perhaps to the amount of his salary: and the other is suffered to perish for want of employment, and his privations aggravated by contributing to the maintenance of persons whose claims at all events are not greater than his own.

It was by a liberal grant of pensions and compensations to the members of the Irish parliament, that Mr. Pitt, through the agency of lord Castlereagh and marquis Cornwallis, was enabled to accomplish the Union. From page 408, it appears, that more than £80,000 is annually paid to persons for the loss of office, in consequence of that great legislative movement. Sir Jonah Barrington relates that, "Among other curious claims for Union compensation, appears one from the Lord-Lieutenant's *rat-catcher*, at the castle, for decrease of employment; another from the *necessary-woman* of the privy-council of England for the increased trouble in her department; with numerous others of the same quality."* Besides compensations, there was super-added a liberal grant of peerages, and £1,500,000 was raised to compensate refractory members for loss of boroughs; Lords Ely, Shannon, Clanmorris, Belvidere, and Sir Hercules Langrishe, received

* Historic Memoirs of Ireland, and Secret Anecdotes of the National Convention, the Rebellion, and the Union.

£143,000, the first noblemen being paid £90,000 for their six members !

It is, however, to the fatal wars of the Aristocracy we are principally indebted for the immense number of compensations, as well as every other national calamity. The vast extent of our establishments, during the period of hostilities, and their reduction since the peace, has made one very considerable portion of the community sinecure dependents on the other for support ; and the extent to which the public is now burthened, in providing for *non-effective* services, is almost incredible.

It appears from the inquiries of Sir H. Parnell's committee, that the non-effective of the army, navy, and ordnance costs the country £4,904,499 a year ; while the effective of the same costs £15,616,354 : so that nearly one-third, or thirty-three per cent., is paid for no manner of service whatever. Again, in the civil departments of the government, the sum of £4,371,000 is paid for salaries, and other effective services ; and £440,000 for compensations, and other non-effective services, the latter being actually one-tenth part of the former.*

Such a monstrous system could never have grown up, except under a most negligent and lavish administration, directly interested in the corruptions it tolerated. It would be easy to cite examples of the most shameless abuses, in granting compensations and retired allowances. The recent attempts to fasten the sons of Earl Bathurst and Lord Melville on the public, under these denominations, must be still remembered. In the official returns, to which we have alluded, we find Mr. Penn, a clerk of the customs, was superannuated upon £750 a year for his important services ; but though superannuated for the customs, he was made agent for Ceylon, at a salary of £1050. In 1822, Alfred Johnson, agent-victualler at the Cape of Good Hope, retired on a pension of £400, and reappeared in 1826 as secretary to the commissioners of the navy at Plymouth. Thomas Alexander, store-keeper at Martinique, was superannuated in 1815, at £175 a year, and just ten years after *debouched* again as store-keeper at Mauritius, at £400 salary.†

Of those who are receiving compensations until *otherwise provided for*, the following may be taken as specimens. Henry Hallam, esq. late commissioner of stamps, £500 a year ; Charles Jolly, examiner of taxes, £230 ; J. D. Smith, landing waiter, £375 ; Alexander Clegghorn, inspector of imports, £416 ; John Hughes, an unattached barrack-master, £182 ; W. R. Marshall, clerk of survey, Woolwich, £450 ; Pierce Edgecumbe, clerk, Chatham-yard, £416. Separately these *pro tempore* allowances are not of much consequence ; but when the number of them comes to be considerable, it raises the total amount to a serious sum. After all, it is not clerks, and other small fry, whom we first wish to see cut down ; it is the great consumers of taxes—the

* Third Report on the Public Income and Expenditure ; Parliamentary Paper, vol. v. Sess. 1828.

† Parliamentary Paper, No. 450, Sess. 1830.

high Aristocracy, who, with extensive domains, enjoy valuable sinecures, and receive enormous salaries, and especially such pensioners as Prince Leopold, Eldon, Bexley, Grenville, Lyndhurst, Sidmouth, and others of that calibre, whom we desire to see curtailed.

COMMISSIONERS OF INQUIRY.—These form a numerous and burthensome class, most of them receiving salaries of from £1000 to £1500. They are a sort of servants of servants; being set on foot by those who ought to be the servants of the people, to do the work which they themselves have been deputed to perform. The ostensible objects of most of the commissions now in operation are, to inquire into the laws and judicial administration, to inquire into the state of public charities, the national records, the duties, salaries, and emoluments in courts of justice in Ireland, the management of certain branches of the revenue in Great Britain, and the state of the Scotch Universities. The labours of some commissioners, it cannot be denied have been productive of the most beneficial results; others have been instituted merely as pretexts for jobs, to extort more plunder from the people. The unpaid services of parliamentary committees have contributed, more than any other form of inquiry, to the exposition and amendment of public abuses.

SALARIES AND PENSIONS EXCEEDING ONE THOUSAND POUNDS.

Great as are the salaries, pensions, and emoluments of individuals, it must be constantly borne in mind that these constitute the smallest part of the advantages, or perhaps we may term it corruptive influence, to which official men are exposed. The most important, the most seductive, and most tempting adjuncts to public offices of the higher grade are the vast patronage, the power and personal consideration they confer on the possessors. In this consists the great difference between government employments and the pursuits of trade and commerce. There are, we doubt not, individual merchants and manufacturers who do—or at least have—realized an annual profit equal to the salaries of a first lord of the Treasury, Secretary of State, the Chief Justice, or even the Lord Chancellor. But observe the difference in their respective situations; observe the dazzling and glittering elevation of the state functionaries; observe the good things they have at their disposal—the benefices, bishoprics, commissionerships of customs and excise; the clerkships, registrarships, and secretaryships, with from £1000 to £10,000 a year—and think of the opportunities afforded by these splendid gifts for enriching their families and friends—and think, too, of the delightful incense of adulation and obsequiousness the dispensers of such favours must en hale, and of the host of fawning sycophants, expectants and dependents, they must every where raise up around them. Here are the real *sweets of office*, the delicious flavour of which can never be tasted by a mercantile man, however successful in his vocation.

What is it which makes individuals seek anxiously to be placed in the magistracy, or sacrifice a fortune for a seat in the House of Com-

mons? It is not the direct salary or emoluments, for there are none; it is the power and the chance of obtaining power, and the personal consideration it gives. A directorship in the Bank of England, or in the East-India Company is unprofitable except from opening a wide field for valuable appointments and individual influence. But if objects like these can rouse up to an intense degree human cupidity, how much more must it be excited by a chance of obtaining the great prizes of state, which yield not only great direct emolument, but boundless patronage, and an authority and pageantry almost regal!

In considering, therefore, the salaries of civil and judicial officers, it is always necessary to bear in mind that they form only a single element in the multifarious advantages of their situations. The patronage of most public officers would be ample remuneration; and were it limited to that alone we have no apprehension there would be a dearth of candidates for official employments, no more than there are for the magistracy, shrievalties, *custos rotolorum*, lord lieutenancies, and other unpaid services.

We have been drawn into these observations from reflecting on a singular public document before us, and of the contents of which we shall give the reader some account. We have hitherto spoken of placemen and pensioners generally; we shall now direct attention to the highest class, whose emoluments *exceed* £1000 *per annum*, and of which a return has been made to parliament.* Why Sir James Graham restricted his motion to functionaries of the transcendental order, it is not easy to conjecture; perhaps it is the intention of the Whig ministry to make £1000 the maximum of official remuneration,—a proposition which the community would hail with great thankfulness as one of the most effective blows ever aimed at sinecurism, deputyships, and aristocrat idlers. Our opinion indeed is that, with a few exceptions, the emoluments of no public officer ought to exceed £1000; few persons with higher incomes will *work*, and they only tend to generate a taste for luxury, equipage, club-houses, gambling, and the frivolities and dissipation of fashionable life.

To come, however, to an analysis of the return to which we have alluded. It comprises 956 individuals whose incomes amount to £2,161,927, averaging £2261 each; there are *forty-two* persons whose incomes are not less than £5000 each, and whose united incomes amount to £339,809; and there are ELEVEN individuals whose incomes are not less than £10,000 each, and who altogether receive £139,817 per annum. Of the whole 956 names the following is a classification, showing the total income of the several classes, and the average income of each individual.

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 23, Session 1830-1.

Classification of 956 Placemen and Pensioners whose Salaries, Profits, Pay, Fees, and Emoluments exceeded, January 5, 1830, £1000 per Annum.

No of Officers.	Description,	Total Emoluments.	Average Income.
350	Civil Officers	£698,805	£1997
50	Court of Chancery	137,216	2744
112	King's Bench and other Judicial Officers	338,651	3023
100	Ambassadors and Consuls	256,780	2567
134	Military Officers.....	240,847	1794
36	Ordnance and Artillery.....	50,155	1390
19	Naval Officers.....	39,835	2076
147	Colonial Officers.....	378,996	2578
8	Officers of the House of Commons	20,642	2567

The lawyers evidently profit most by the system ; their average emolument exceed those of any other class ; the civilians of all classes are better remunerated than the military ; and the officers of the army rather better than those of the navy. The worst paid are *employes* in the Ordnance ; this branch of the service requiring men of science and application, is not sought after by the great families, and hence we observe the *working* of our aristocratical government in this department as in every other ; the most meritorious and arduous duty not being performed by the Oligarchy and their dependents, it is rewarded by the fewest number and least valuable prizes.

It is not, however, by *averaging* the incomes of public functionaries that we see the iniquities of the Borough System in its most conspicuous light. In the state, as in the church, the most flagrant abuse consists in *pluralities*, in the power which individuals of title, influence, and connexion have to heap upon themselves, families, and friends, a multiplicity of offices. Next to this abuse is that of patronage. We know that the direct income of a lord of the Treasury, or a secretary of state, is very considerable, and that of a lord chief justice or lord chancellor is enormous ; but what is that to the value of their patronage. All their immense patronage is so much direct revenue, and we know that it is applied as such in making provisions for sons, sons-in-law, and collaterals. We might cite the Bathursts, Mannors, Abbots, Scotts, and others ; but we think the subject has been already sufficiently illustrated, and further proof will be found in our *Place and Pension List*.

We shall conclude the section with the names of the forty-two great tax and fee eaters as returned to the House of Commons ; it will be observed that neither Prince Leopold nor any member of the royal family is included.

List of FORTY-TWO Placemen and Pensioners whose total Incomes in the Year ending January 5, 1830, amounted to £339,809.

<i>Sir William Alexander, Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer.....</i>	<i>£7,016</i>
<i>Sir Charles Bagot, Ambassador at the Hague</i>	<i>11,661</i>
<i>Viscount Beresford, Master General of the Ordnance</i>	<i>7,927</i>
<i>Earl of Belmore, Governor of Jamaica</i>	<i>7,000</i>
<i>Lieut.-Gen. Sir Edward Barnes, Governor of Ceylon</i>	<i>10,000</i>
<i>Sir William Bolland, Baron of the Court of Exchequer</i>	<i>5,516</i>
<i>Sir John Bayley, Judge of the Court of King's Bench</i>	<i>5,540</i>
<i>Sir C. Colville, Governor of the Mauritius</i>	<i>8,000</i>
<i>Lord Cowley, Ambassador at Vienna.....</i>	<i>12,000</i>
<i>Sir George Don, Lieut.-Governor and Commander-in-chief, Gibraltar ..</i>	<i>5,000</i>
<i>Lord Ellenborough President of the India Board</i>	<i>14,625</i>
<i>Sir A. Hart, Lord Chancellor of Ireland</i>	<i>9,834</i>
<i>Duke of Grafton, Hereditary Pensions out of Excise and Post Office ..</i>	<i>11,900</i>
<i>Sir William Garrow, Baron of the Exchequer.....</i>	<i>5,516</i>
<i>Lord Heytesbury, Ambassador at St. Petersburg</i>	<i>12,000</i>
<i>Sir Launcelot Shadwell, Vice-Chancellor</i>	<i>6,000</i>
<i>Sir John Leach, Master of the Rolls</i>	<i>7,000</i>
<i>Hon. Thomas Kenyon, Clerk of Out-lawries in the Court of King's Bench</i>	<i>6,717</i>
<i>Mr. Thomas Thurlow, Patentee for the execution of Bankrupt Laws</i>	<i>8,502</i>
<i>Mr. Justice Park, One of the Judges of the King's Bench</i>	<i>5,500</i>
<i>Duke of Northumberland, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland</i>	<i>23,153</i>
<i>Viscount Melville, First Lord of the Admiralty</i>	<i>7,675</i>
<i>Duke of Wellington, First Lord of the Treasury.....</i>	<i>13,168</i>
<i>Earl Nelson, Pension by Act of Parliament.....</i>	<i>5,000</i>
<i>Lord Lyndhurst, Lord High Chancellor</i>	<i>10,271</i>
<i>Duke of Marlborough, Pension out of Post Office Revenues.....</i>	<i>5,000</i>
<i>Charles Short, Esq., Clerk of the Rules of the King's Bench Prison ...</i>	<i>5,172</i>
<i>Duke of Montrose, Lord Chamberlain</i>	<i>5,053</i>
<i>C. C. F. Greville, Clerk of the Council</i>	<i>5,000</i>
<i>Right Hon. Sir R. Peel, Secretary for the Home Department</i>	<i>6,000</i>
<i>Lord Tenterden, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench</i>	<i>10,000</i>
<i>Sir John Vaughan, Baron of the Court of Exchequer</i>	<i>5,516</i>
<i>Lord Stuart de Rothsay, Ambassador at Paris</i>	<i>11,000</i>
<i>Sir H. Cole, Governor of the Cape of Good Hope</i>	<i>7,000</i>
<i>Right Hon. Charles Manners Sutton, Speaker of the House of Commons</i>	<i>6,000</i>
<i>Sir P. Maitland, Governor of Nova Scotia.....</i>	<i>6,593</i>
<i>Sir James Kempt, Cammander of the Forces, Canada</i>	<i>9,166</i>
<i>Right Hon. Gen. Lord Hill, Commander-in-Chief.....</i>	<i>7,434</i>
<i>Sir B. D. D'Urban, Governor of Demerara.....</i>	<i>5,877</i>
<i>Sir James Lyon, Governor of Barbadoes</i>	<i>6,766</i>
<i>Sir Brook Taylor, Ambassador at Berlin</i>	<i>5,165</i>
<i>Right Hon. C. R. Vaughan, Ambassador to the United States</i>	<i>6,000</i>

It cannot be alleged against the preceding statement that it abounds either in falsehoods or misrepresentations. Like Earl Grey's famous petition, setting forth the state of parliamentary representation, it contains facts which can neither be denied nor controverted. The returns from which the above has been copied are not complete; various pensions and sources of emolument having been omitted. Had the return been perfect, and had they included the incomes of relatives and dependents, they would have presented an aggregate of revenue drawn from the public by forty-two families almost incredible.

Having treated on the several subjects of this chapter, it only remains to recapitulate: the public documents, from which the several accounts have been taken, having been already cited, need not be repeated in the subjoined summary. It will be also observed, that the expenditure of the Crown and Royal Family is omitted, that having been fully detailed in a former part of this work.

A Statement of the Annual Expenditure of the United Kingdom, in Salaries, Pensions, Sinecures, Half-pay, Superannuations, Compensations, and Allowances.

Salaries of 22,912 persons employed in the public offices	£2,788,907
Retired full-pay, half-pay, superannuations, pensions and allowances	
in the army	2,939,652
Ditto ditto in the Navy	1,583,797
Ditto ditto in the Ordnance	374,987
Superannuated allowances in the civil departments of government..	478,967
Pensions	777,556
Pensions in the nature of compensations for the loss of offices in	
England	12,020
Ditto in Ireland, chiefly in consequence of the Union,	89,245
Annual value of sinecure offices	356,555
Commissioners of Inquiry	56,299
	<hr/>
	£9,457,985.
	<hr/>

Can any one believe that, in these few items, a saving of at least three millions might not be effected? And with a saving even to this amount, how many oppressive taxes might be repealed! If we further extend our view to other departments of the government, and to the courts of law, the civil list, the colonies, the monopolies of the Bank and East-India Company, the established church, and the corn-laws, what an ample field presents itself to our consideration for the relief of this suffering and oppressed community.

But will government ever avail itself of these vast resources as the

means of national amelioration? Never: it is impossible under the existing system. Effective retrenchment, without a previous parliamentary reform, is a chimera; To retrench is to *weaken*; the true policy of the Oligarchy is to spend, not to save. There are, no doubt, scores, nay, hundreds of offices and establishments useless, indeed, to the people, but invaluable to their rulers. The greater the sinecure, the greater its importance to the Aristocracy; and the very reason urged by the people for its extinction, is the strongest argument for its retention by their oppressors. Could government only reward its servants according to their deserts, what inducement would there be to enter into its service? Who would incur the odium of such employment! How could it obtain adherents? How could it so long have had zealous supporters in every part of the empire, and carried on a detestable system, subversive of the rights, and incompatible with the happiness of the community?

Ever since the death of Fox and Pitt there has been scarcely an individual with the least pretension to the endowments of a statesman in the administration. Look over the roll of the Percevals, Vansittarts, Castlereaghs, Jenkinsons, Cannings, Sidmouths, Huskissons, and Scotts, and say, if there is one that did not deserve a halter, or whose proper place was not behind a counter, in lieu of directing the resolves of a legislative assembly. Yet by these, and such as these, were the destinies of this great empire swayed for upwards of twenty years. Can we wonder at the frightful results of their empyrical statesmanship? Can we wonder that they bequeathed to their successors, convulsion, decay, and death, in every fibre of the kingdom? But incapable, vile, and unprincipled as these men were, ignorant and reckless, as experience has proved them to be, of the ultimate issues of their measures; still these scions of the Pitt school were too sagacious ever to think that retrenchment and rotten boroughs were compatible elements of the constitution. They knew better; they had been too long familiar with the secret pulses and springs of the state machinery to commit so egregious a mistake. Their dependence was on *force* and *corruption*; on the bayonets of the military, and the annual expenditure of eighty millions of money. These formed the right and left hands, the master principles of their policy. The support they could not bribe they sought to intimidate. Such was their black and iron system; it lasted *their time*, or the time of most of the pillaging and hypocritical crew; and for any thing beyond they did not care a rush!

Let us hope that we are on the eve of better times, that we shall not be deluded by temporary expedients and professions, put forth merely to gain time for plundering, nor quack remedies to be followed by mortal maladies; in short, let us hope the new ministry will proceed on scientific principles, and that we shall have a parliamentary reform first, and next such an effective retrenchment and disposition of public burthens as will afford real national relief.

"Corruption wins not more than honesty;" and the true end of government is not difficult to attain. It is simply to augment social hap-

piness—affording equal security to the property and persons of every individual,—protecting the weak against the strong,—the poor against the rich; in short, by guarding against the extremes of indigence and crime, luxury and vice, and spreading an equilibrium of comfort and enjoyment through all ranks, by good laws, wisely conceived, promptly and impartially administered.

It is a cheap and admirable contrivance, when established on the rights, and supported by the confidence of the public. There is then no need of standing armies in time of peace. There is no need of expending sixteen millions a year in support of naval and military establishments. There is no need of a Sinking Fund as a resource for future war. Government is strong in the affections of the people. It is prepared for every exigence, and must always be invincible against domestic foes and foreign aggressors. But, if government has not this support; if it is looked upon only as an instrument of rapacity and extortion; if it is looked upon as a legalized system of pillage, fraud, and delusion; if it is looked upon only as an artful cabal of tyrants united for plunder and oppression; then must such a government, instead of being a cheap and simple institution, be a complex and expensive establishment—strong, not in the people, but in its means of corruption, delusion, and intimidation.

The English government has been long approximating to the latter predicament. It has ceased to possess the respect and confidence of the people, and has governed by over-awing the weak, deluding the ignorant, and corrupting the baser part of the community. The latter—its power of corruption—its means of rewarding its adherents by the *spoil of the people*, is the great lever by which it has operated. This power, its connexion and influence, as exhibited in the church-establishment, the judicial administration, the public offices and departments, and chartered monopolies, we have fully exposed; and it only now remains to record the *names* and emoluments of those who chiefly profit by its abuses and perversions.

LIST

OF

PLACEMEN, PENSIONERS, &c.

EXPLANATIONS.

THE subjoined *List* has been principally prepared from the Parliamentary Papers Nos. 480, 479, 95, 273, 587, and 58, of the Session, 1830; and from Parliamentary Papers, Nos. 23, 42, and 56 of Session, 1830-1. We have been indebted to other official returns for pensions payable by the East-India Company and out of the fee-funds of the public departments. No. 23 is an important document, containing returns of emoluments exceeding £1000 a year; but it is defective in many respects: it comprises no returns from the Admiralty Court, from the Court of Common Pleas, nor from the courts of the counties palatine of Lancaster and Durham, nor from the Duchy of Cornwall; nor is there any return of the salaries and emoluments of officers of the House of Lords. Even of the individuals returned the *whole* of their emoluments have not been included; as in the cases of the Duke of Grafton, Marquis Wellesley, and Lord Chancellor.

The same system of mystification and perplexity is observable in the payment of salaries and pensions as in other departments of the public accounts. The incomes of placemen, for example, arise partly from salaries paid by government and partly from fees paid by individuals. Pensions are paid out of at least half a score of different funds and by nearly as many different authorities. Some are parliamentary pensions charged on the revenue of taxes; others are court pensions, charged on the English, Irish, or Scotch civil list; others are ministerial pensions, charged on the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. Leeward Island Duties; and other pensions are granted under the authority of the 57 Geo. III. and 6 Geo. IV.; and then again an immense number of pensions have been granted under authority of 50 Geo. III. c. 117, which empowers the lords of the Treasury to award pensions payable out of the fees received in the public offices. These are exclusive of pensions payable by the East-India Company, and out of the colonial revenues of Ceylon, Mauritius, and other dependencies. Some individuals have been fortunate enough to obtain pensions on several funds; others again have had two or three or four pensions granted in succession, charged on the same fund.

To the people these distinctions are comparatively uninteresting; it is sufficient for them to know that all salaries, pensions, fees, compensations, and allowances, by whomsoever granted, or out of whatever fund paid, ultimately proceed from the produce of industry, and that the misapplication of them for any other than effective *public services*, or for services that have been already sufficiently remunerated by patronage or emolument, is nothing better than speculation and robbery, whether committed by the king, his ministers, or the houses of parliament.

We thought at first of giving separate lists of the members of the Privy Coun-

cil, the House of Peers, and the House of Commons, holding places, pensions, commissions, or emoluments, but on this plan the reader might have been often at a loss under what head to look for individuals, whereas, having adopted an alphabetical arrangement, every facility is afforded for direct reference to any name or title. All the sums put down, whether salaries, pensions, compensations, or other denomination, are *annual* payments, and with respect to salaries were the amount received for the year ending Jan. 5, 1830. Where a *date* is inserted it refers to the year when the place was obtained, or the pension first granted. From the salaries and pensions returned have been deducted all exchequer fees and duties, and they are the net amount actually received. Court pensions charged on the civil list of England, Ireland, and Scotland are distinguished by the initials, c. l.

The appointments under the Whig ministry, and the alterations in consequence of the resignation of the Wellington administration have been included, so as to render the *List* correct to the period of publication.

Abbott, Thomas, clerk at nisi prius to chief justice of king's bench	£1000
Abbott, John Henry, marshal and associate to chief justice, of king's bench	2665
..... commissioner of bankrupts	320
The last is the son of lord Tenterden, and the preceding, we believe, not a very distant relative.	
Aberdeen, R. collector of customs, Bridge Town, Barbadoes ..	2000
Aberdeen, earl of, late secretary for foreign affairs	
We do not know whether the Duke and his ministerial staff intend to claim retiring pensions, after their two years high and efficient civil services; if so, the ex-foreign secretary and renowned professor of diplomatic conceits will be saddled upon us, for life, for £2000 or £3000 per annum. We trust, however, the noble earl and his late coadjutors in the Holy Alliance school of politics, will have some regard to our distressed and impoverished condition; we are sincerely grateful for all the good they have done, and still more so for all the evil they have been so seasonably prevented doing, and we wish now to be quits and have done with them for ever.	
Abergavenny, earl of, compensation allowance for loss of office as inspector of prosecutions in customs	1545
This place was abolished by the 51 Geo. III. as a sinecure, and no compensation ought to have been granted for the loss of it. But surely the noble Earl has received enough of the public money for the loss of an office voted useless twenty years since.	
Abercrombie, lord, hereditary pension by act of parliament ..	2000
Abercrombie, J. brother of the preceding, lord chief baron of the exchequer, Scotland	4000
Adair, Robert, late ambassador to the Ottoman Porte	2300
Adair, Robert, Diana, and Elizabeth, c. l. June 1772	445
Adam, William, lord chief commissioner of jury court; Scotland ..	4000
Adam, major-gen. Sir F. col. 73d foot, unattached pay	434
Staff pay as lieut.-gen. commanding in the Ionian Islands	1383
Pension for wounds	300
Adams, W. D. commissioner of woods and forests	1200
Late comptroller of the lottery	375
Addington, Henry Unwin, minister at Madrid	3802

Aiton, W. T. director-general of his majesty's gardens and plantations	£1400
Albemarle, earl of, master of the horse	3350

Can the magnitude of the civil list be matter of surprise when such monstrous salaries as this are paid out of it? £1000 would be enough for any master of the horse. It might have been expected such a great county meeting patriot as my lord Albemarle and the father-in-law of the veteran Whig, Mr. Coke, would have made his *first* appearance in public in some other capacity than a court lord.

Alexander, sir W. chief baron of court of exchequer	7016
Alderson, sir E. H. puisne judge common pleas	5500
Alison, John, distributor of stamps for Dundee, <i>Sept.</i> 1828 ..	445
Late stamp-master of linen, Scotland	151
Althorp, lord, chancellor of the exchequer	5220

In some instances the Whigs seem to have taken their appointments rather by the claims of seniority than merit. Lord Althorp's reputation has always been respectable; over his party he has long exercised a kind of magisterial direction, which it may be presumed he would not have been enabled to do unless he had inherited other gifts beside heraldic rank; but we have always understood his talents to be more judicial than financial. If, however, his genius lies this way he has a fine field for its beneficial exertion in the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. We do not mean he can do any good by shuffling the cards, by repeating tricks of legerdemain which have been tried by his predecessors, and always ended in moonshine; but he may render the country substantial service by abolishing useless places—by reducing all salaries to the standard of 1793, from the first lord of the Treasury downwards—by removing imposts and bounties which impede some and artificially encourage other branches of industry—by repealing duties which are vexatious and expensive in the collection, and substituting others equally productive, but less onerous: in short his object ought to be to make an entire new disposition of the imposts absolutely necessary for the public service; our aristocratic government has given rise to an aristocratic system of taxation, and his object ought to be to remove this opprobrium, by repealing the host of taxes levied on articles of ordinary consumption, and which we have shewn to operate more oppressively than the most iniquitous income-tax, and substitute in lieu of them a land-tax, tithe-tax, or property-tax, that would be at once productive, cheaply gathered, and press only upon the classes most able to bear the burthen. By such reform in our fiscal administration, his lordship would restore public confidence, and acquire a distinct and specific character, which we cannot say he at present possesses in the country.

Allen, J. receiver-general of taxes, Somerset	600
Allen, Frances, viscountess, pension on c. l. <i>July</i> 1799	266
Pension on c. l. <i>Oct.</i> 1800	83
Allen, viscount, pension on c. l. <i>Sept.</i> 1821	266
Allen, L. B. one of six clerks in chancery	1217
Alves, H. S. senior clerk, India board	900
Master of the mint, Scotland	390
Amedroz, H. F. clerk of first class, Admiralty, <i>Jan.</i> 1799 ..	780
Translator of foreign papers, 1800	100

Amherst, earl, lord of the bedchamber	£800
Hereditary pension, by act of parliament	3000

This is one of the most objectionable of the *hereditary* pensions. It was transmitted by the uncle of the peer, sir Jeffrey Amherst, a favourite of George III. and placed by him at the head of the army; when, as commander-in-chief, he introduced and protected such bare-faced jobbing and traffic in commissions as both disgraced and ruined our military power. The loyalty of that day was not to entertain even a suspicion of the misconduct of the individual who had the ear of royalty, however flagrant, and thus the court favourite died in the full enjoyment of the rewards of his baseness, and left the army of England to his successor as a body in name than in reality.

The services of lord Amherst in Canada were of no great importance, yet they were rewarded with the extravagant pension of £3000 a year—£1000 more than was ever voted by a squandering house of commons to the heroes of the peninsular war. The present Earl cannot object to have one-half, or at least one third of his unearned hereditary allowance cut-off. It may be urged, indeed, that this pension was granted by act of parliament and therefore irrevocable; but what more mutable and evanescent than acts of parliament? are they not constantly being repealed, altered and amended? what progress could be made in the improvement of the judicial administration were not hundreds of unintelligible and inapplicable statutes abrogated. Grants and conveyances of property are constantly being set aside in courts of equity for want of a *good title* or *adequate* consideration; and why should the whole mass of pensions, allowances, and compensations be held more sacred? It is sheer nonsense to think about the existing generation and posterity being tied up for ever by the folly, ignorance, prodigality, and short sightedness of their progenitors.

Amyot, T. registrar of colonial slaves	800
Compensation for loss of office of registrar in Canada	400
Anglesea, marquis of, lord lieutenant of Ireland	20000
Colonel of the 7th dragoons	no return
Angell, J. chief clerk, ordnance-office	1162
Andrews, Robert, receiver-general of taxes, Essex	517
Anson, viscount, master of the buckhounds	2606

Here is another shameful salary payable out of the civil list. Good God, if the king had two millions in lieu of one he might waste them on the aristocracy at this rate! If the Whigs be sincere in their professions of retrenchment, why not have abolished this office on the resignation of lord Maryborough? William IV. we believe, is too intent on meeting the wishes of the people to have opposed any objection, besides it is only a feudal sinecure, conducive neither to regal dignity nor enjoyment.

Anson, sir George, M.P. for Lichfield; lieut.-gen. and col. of 4th dragoon guards, pay	911
Anstruther, P. collector of revenue, Ceylon	1538
Antrobus, G. C. M.P. for Plympton; secretary of legation, Naples	1500
Arden, C. G. Perceval lord, registrar of the court of Admiralty	38574

This sum was the gross amount of his lordship's income during the war;—deductions were given in to the amount of

£26,012, making his net income £12,562. In the late returns of incomes exceeding £1000, the court of Admiralty was omitted, so we have no authentic means of estimating his lordship's emoluments since the peace. His disinterested loyalty was marvellously exemplified in an animated speech he once made in the upper house, in defence of reversionary grants; asserting that an attempt to abolish them was an "*indecent attack upon the king's LAWFUL prerogative.*" His lordship has two sons in the church and another in the navy.

Arthur, Colonel, lieutenant-governor, Van Dieman's Land ..	£2500
Arnaud, E. collector of customs, Liverpool	2500
Arbuthnot, major-gen. sir T. staff, western district, Ireland ..	891
Unattached pay as major-general	310
Pension for a wound	300
Arbuthnot, Henry, commissioner of audit.....	1200
Arbuthnot, Harriet, pension on c. l. 1823	938
Arbuthnot, Catherine and Jane, pension on c. l. 1804, each ..	138
Archdall, Mervyn, M.P. for Fermanagh; a general and lieutenant-governor of the Isle of Wight	1379
Argyle, duke of, keeper of great seal, Scotland.....	1850
Come, gentlemen Whigs, we have you on the hip again! you have declared the days are past when government depends on patronage for support. Now to the proof: here is a complete sinecure, having no duties whatever attached to it;—why did you not cut it off on the resignation of the duke of Gordon? it is not sufficient to say such useless dignities are unavoidable in a monarchy; individuals have long since been compelled to give up luxuries and even comforts, and royalty must give up its <i>trappings</i> .	
Arnold, J. R. lieutenant-col. royal engineers, 1814	330
Extra pay, commanding royal engineers, northern district.	165
Allowance for a servant	27
Pension for wounds, 1816	300
Ashworth, Robert, pension on civil list, <i>April 1787</i>	1072
Ashworth, Henrietta, pension on c. l.	266
Ashworth, Frederick, pension on c. l.	266
Ashworth, Charles, pension on c. l.	177
Ashton, A. secretary and chargé d'affairs at Rio de Janeiro ..	1368
Athlone, earl of, hereditary pension, Ireland, by act of parliament	2000
This family, the <i>De Ginkells</i> , came over with William III. in 1688 and was one his instruments of oppression in Ireland. It was rewarded by a grant of 26,000 acres of land, the forfeited possessions of the earl of Limerick. This grant was reversed by parliament, and the family retired to Holland, whence they returned on the expulsion of the Stadtholder. The Earl took his seat in the Irish house of lords in 1795, and reclaimed his pension. In 1823 the ninth Earl of the name died, and he was succeeded in the title and pension by his son George, a child now in the tenth year of his age.	
Auckland, lord, master of the mint	3000
President of the board of trade	2000
Pension on civil list, <i>July 1814</i>	300

Pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent fund, <i>July</i> 1820	£400
We have put down the salaries of the master of the mint, and president of the board of trade ; but as both these offices have been given to lord Auckland we imagine it forms part of the Whig plan of retrenchment, to abolish the former or have its nominal duties annexed to those of the board of trade.	
Audley, lord, pension on c. l. 1821	462
Avonmore, viscount, late principal registrar, court of chancery, Ireland	4199
Awdry, J. receiver-general of taxes, Wilts	600
Aylmer, lieut.-gen. lord, colonel 56th foot, pay, clothing, and emoluments	1208
Pension on civil list, <i>Feb.</i> 1783	356
Backhouse, John and J. Lewis, pensions out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, <i>Sept.</i> 1827	500
Backhouse, John, under secretary of state	500
Receiver-general of excise	1500
Badger, A. auditor for land revenue, Wales	750
Bagot, W. receiver of taxes, London and Middlesex	1200
Bagot, sir C. ambassador to the Hague	11661
Bagot, G. second fiscal, Demerara	1228
Bankhead, Penelope Mary, pension on c. l. 1825	350
Barnard, Edw. pension on c. l. 1823	500
Barraud, William, receiver of duties, customs	1160
Bathurst, earl, teller of his majesty's exchequer	2700
Clerk of the crown in chancery	1105
Bathurst, Charlotte, pension on civil list, 1823	600
Pension on civil list, 1825	200
Pension on civil list, 1829	100
Bathurst, Mary, pension on civil list, 1826	250
Bathurst, hon. Charles, pension on civil list, 1826	350
Commissioner of bankrupts and receiver of duchy court of Lancaster	850
Bathurst, hon. W. deputy teller, exchequer	1000
Clerk in privy council office	2000
Bathurst, hon. S. treasurer to government, Malta	1560

Few persons have evinced a more exemplary appetite for the public money than lord Bathurst. His lordship's family has mostly been in the receipt of £10,000 or £12,000 a year, from fees, pensions, and taxes. He still retains two valuable sinecures, his son William Lennox one, and an office nearly a sinecure, and his son Seymour Thomas another. Within the last few months he has been strenuous in his efforts to obtain *firmer hold* ; first he tried to superannuate his second son, who had been a couple of years in the victualling office, as a retired commissioner ; failing in that, he next, with the most indecent precipitancy and almost by absolute force, thrust him into the office of the late Mr. Buller, as clerk of the privy council. If one did not know that the assurance of men is mostly in the inverse proportion of their deserts they would be surprised at the pecuniary audacity of this nobleman. Lord Bathurst

is notoriously a person with the least possible claims to public honour and emoluments: he is altogether without talent; a most feeble, awkward, and puzzled speaker; and in every sense of the word a most trifling personage.	
Bannatyne, sir W. M ^c Leod, late lord of session, Scotland	£1500
Baring, F. M.P. for Portsmouth, commissioner of the treasury	1220
Bates, Edw. husband of the 4½ per cent duties, <i>Jan.</i> 1821 . .	400
Secretary to the board of taxes, <i>Feb.</i> 1823	1500
Ballantyne, W. police justice, Thames-street	800
Barrow, John, second secretary to the Admiralty	1500
Barlow, Francis, secretary for commissions of bankrupts	2309
Barlow, P. mathematical master, Woolwich-academy	380
Barton, J. deputy comptroller, mint-office	600
Barnard, Edward, retired allowance as clerk, colonial office	200
Agent for New South Wales, Van Dieman's Land	600
Barker, John, consul-general in Egypt	6151
Batley, W. collector of customs, Ipswich	350
Barnes, J. H. petition-clerk, customs	350
Barnes, lieut.-gen. sir Edw. governor of Ceylon	10000
Receives, also, military allowances as commander of forces, and col. of 78th foot.	
Barnard, major-gen. sir And. colonel of rifle brigade, 1st. batt. pay and emoluments	1182
Equerry to the king	749
Barneby, P. receiver-general of taxes, Hereford	400
Baker, A. St. John, consul-general at Washington	1600
Baker, lady Elizabeth Mary, pension for life, c. l. 1814	461
Baker, rear-adm. Tho. commander-in-chief, South America, part of the year	1545
Baker, sir Robert, pension on civil list, 1822	500
Bankes, G. M.P. for Corfe Castle; cursitor baron of the exchequer	455
Baillie, G. clerk in colonial secretary's office	739
Agent for Sierra Leone and the royal African corps . .	639
Barnouin, J. H. chief clerk to clerk of ordnance	1062
Barry, colonel, secretary to government of Mauritius	3150
Barrington, hon. G. son-in-law of earl Grey, cursitor of county palatine of Durham, and captain in the navy; lord of the admiralty	1000
Batt, T. John, pension on civil list, 1806	600
Bandinel, James, clerk in office of secretary for foreign affairs	1200
Bayley, sir John, one of the barons of the court of exchequer	5516
Bayley, sir D. consul-general at St Petersburg	1000
Bayly, lieut.-gen. H. col. 8th foot, pay and emoluments	1320
Pension for wounds	350
Equerry to the king	749
Beard, H. lieut.-governor of Berbice	4000

422 PLACES, PENSIONS, SINECURES, AND GRANTS.

Beauclerk, John, commissioner of bankrupts, 1797	£450
Recorder of Northampton, 1828	750
Beauclerk, J. receiver-general of taxes for Northampton and Rutland	600
Beaufort, capt. F. hydrographer to admiralty, <i>May</i> 1829 ..	691
Beddingfield, John, pension on civil list, 1822;	250
Bedwell, F. B. registrar in court of chancery:—	
Salary	£358
Allowances	110
Fees	3409
	3877
The salaries and allowances of registrars and their clerks are paid out of the suitors' fund.	
Bell, lieut.-col. J. secretary to governor of Cape of Good Hope, colonel of 27th foot, and governor of Tilbury Fort....	2000
Bedford, G. C. clerk to auditor of exchequer	1200
Bernard, John F. clerk in the secretary's office, customs	50
Clerk of the postage	500
Belfast, earl of, M.P. for Antrimshire; vice chamberlain in the king's household	600
Belmore, earl of, governor of Jamaica	7000
Bentham, sir S. pension as late civil architect and surveyor of the navy	1000
Pension for relinquishing an employment in Russia, in 1797	500
Beresford, gen. viscount, col. 16th foot, pay and emoluments	1182
Governor of Jersey	1100
Captain of cadet company	469
Pension by act of parliament	2000
Beresford, H. B. compensation allowance for loss of the office of joint storekeeper, customs	2157
Beresford, J. C. compensation for loss of office of storekeeper, customs	2157
These offices, held by patent, are abolished—and what a compensation! it is a genuine Irish job, and worthy of the plundering family who participate in it. J. C. Beresford is the man of the riding-house flogging celebrity.	
Beresford, major-gen. lord G. R. M.P. for Waterfordshire, col. 3d dragoons, regimental and unattached pay ..	425
Bentinck, gen. lord W. governor-general of the presidency of Bengal, East Indies	25000
Clerk of the pipe in the exchequer, England	1131
Colonel of 11th hussars, pay and emoluments	2511
Look at this man's offices, emoluments, and localities, and then think of the incongruities tolerated under the borough system.	
Bentinck, Jemima Helen, pension on c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1809	300
Bessy, J. F. second under clerk, teller's office	600
Bexley, lord, pension as late chancellor of the Exchequer....	3006

Here is a reward for the most consummate ignorance and laxity of principle. Lord Bexley left the Exchequer from sheer incapacity, and then skulked under the Canning ministry as chancellor of duchy of Lancaster, and after enriching himself in that sinecure, finally graduated on his pension under the profligate 57 Geo. III.	
Bidwell, Thomas, clerk in office of secretary for foreign affairs	£1250
Deputy clerk of the signet	95
Bidwell, John, clerk in the office of secretary for foreign affairs	1400
Binning, D. M. commissioner of customs	1400
Bipland, Thomas, collector of customs, Greenock	800
Birch, J. W. assistant reading clerk, house of lords	1200
Bird, C. clerk, receiver of duties and registrar, Berbice	1730
Bingley, Robert, king's assay-master, mint-office	900
Birnie, sir R. chief magistrate, Bow-street-office, salary and extra allowance for attendance at home-office	1200
Bicknell, H. E. clerk to registrar in chancery	1622
Bingham, C. col. royal artillery, and fire-master royal laboratory Pension for wounds	731 300
Bingham, major-gen. sir G. R. staff, southern district, Ireland Unattached pay as lieutenant-colonel	891 310
Blake, A. R. chief remembrancer of the exchequer, Ireland ..	2817
Blackwood, vice-admiral sir H. commander-in-chief at the Nore Groom of the king's bedchamber	2555 400
Pension on civil list, 1809	300
Blackwood, lady Harriet, pension out of 4½ per cent. fund ..	206
Blakeney, major-gen. sir E. staff, south-western district, Ireland Unattached pay as lieutenant-colonel	691 310
Blackburn, J. distributor of stamps for part of Lancashire	1530
Black, Jean and Mary, pension each, c. l. Aug. 1823	50
Blair, Mrs. Isabella Cornelia, pension on c. l. Oct. 1811	276
Isabella and Cornelia, pension on civil list, 1810, each William, pension on c. l. 1812	138 184
Blaquiere, sir John, during lives of the king and duke of Clarence, c. l. March 1794	1107
Blaquiere, John, lord de, pension on civil list, 1802	839
Blackwell, major-gen. governor of Tobago	3027
Bloomfield, lord, envoy and min. plenipo. in Sweden	4900
Colonel of artillery	1003
Blunt, Joseph. solicitor to the mint	800
Borough, sir R. during pleasure, pension on c. l. Dec. 1794	184
Boger, J. receiver-gen. of taxes, Cornwall	500
Booth, W. deputy commissary-general, half-pay	267
Clerk of the survey, ordnance-department	560
Bowen, Jas. late commissioner of navy	956
Boothby, sir W. receiver-general of customs	1500
Agent for New Brunswick	150
Paymaster of band of gentlemen pensioners	230
A relation by marriage of the "stern path of duty man."	

Bolton, lieut.-general sir R. col. 7th dragoon guards.....	£1334
Equerry to the king	750
Bowles, William, comptroller of coast-guard, <i>July</i> 1822	1000
Captain in the navy, half-pay.....	228
Bowles, Charles and Elizabeth his wife, pension on c. l. 1827	192
Bowden, J. chief clerk to the receiver-general at post-office	600
Inspector of stamps for excise, <i>Aug.</i> 1826	150
Bouverie, major-gen. sir H. F. commanding northern district	874
Unattached pay as major in the coldstream guards....	700
Bouverie, H. I. commissioner of customs	1400
Bouverie, hon. Arabella, pension on civil list, 1821	300
Boulton, K. J. attorney-general, Upper Canada	1534
Bosanquet, G. secretary and chargé d'affairs at Madrid	2260
Bolland, sir W. one of the barons of the court of exchequer..	5516
Bourchier, Chas. assistant solicitor to the treasury.....	1900
Bowden, J. W. commissioner of stamps.....	1012
Boyd, Chas. surveyor-general, customs	800
Boyd, hon. R. deputy inspector of hospitals and commissioner of revenue and commerce	3000
Boyle, David, lord justice clerk, Scotland	4000
Boyle, hon. C. commissioner of navy, 1823	1000
Bradshaw, J. H. clerk and registrar, post-office.....	625
Brande, W. T. superintendent and clerk of the irons, mint- office	700
Brandon, William, baron, pension on c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1820	276
Briggs, J. T. deputy secretary to victualling-board.....	800
Brickdale, comptroller of customs, Bristol	666
Brisbane, lieut.-gen. sir Tho. colonel 34th foot	1095
Brisbane, sir C. governor of St. Vincent	3788
Brackenbury, J. M. consul at Cadiz	1216
Brent, T. secretary, board of green cloth	1185
Secretary to the lord steward	124
Groom and clerk of the robes.....	155
Brent, W. B. commissioner of bankrupts, 1823.....	450
Steward of Marshalsea-court, and steward and judge of Palace-court	no return
Bradford, lieut.-general sir T. col. 30th foot	1311
Pension for wounds.....	350
Brougham, lord chancellor; net salary	£4829
Fees, after deducting £2500 paid to the vice- chancellor and £450 land-tax.....	5442
	10271

Fees as speaker of the House of Lords, not returned.

These were the emoluments of the predecessor of the noble lord, as returned for the year ending January 5th, 1830. We presume the yearly gatherings of lord Brougham will be to a similar amount, and no alteration will be made in the established proportion in

which he will share with his secretaries, clerks, chaff-wax, sealer, purse-bearer, and porter, the multitudinous fees accruing from commissions, petitions, dockets, supersedeas, writs, and certificates. But the pecuniary gains of the chancellorship form only one of its advantages; its great attractions consist in the official precedency it gives, and the vast extent of legal, eleemosynary, and ecclesiastical patronage it places at the disposal of the possessor. Lord Lyndhurst is said to have filled up 120 benefices during the three years of his equity jurisdiction, and the *annual* value of the judicial appointments, in the gift of the chancellor, cannot be less than £50,000 per annum.

In the acceptance of the seals, lord Brougham has been subjected to a great many petulant, and, in our humble opinion, absurd remarks. It has been thought strange a person, possessing such transcendent abilities and unwearied industry, should merge them in the stagnant pool of the house of peers. But ought not the harassing and stormy course of his lordship's previous career to be borne in mind, and may he not, in his latter days, have chosen the woollack from the same motives which prince TALLEYRAND chose a belle and bonhomie spouse,—namely, as convenient for *repose*? We certainly cannot perceive the force of this objection. As cabinet minister, head of the law department, keeper of the king's conscience, and what not, his lordship's sphere and power of usefulness must be vastly extended and augmented. All the manifold abuses, which he has so long forcibly and eloquently set forth in the administration of justice, in charitable foundations, in collegiate endowments, in parliamentary representation, and West Indian slavery, he may now hunt down with a power and means of accomplishment increased a hundred fold. To the pursuit of these objects lord Brougham is solemnly pledged; but if he falter, delay, or equivocate; if he attempt to gain time for the undisturbed indulgence of the sweets of his high office, by substituting reiterated professions for actual performance; if, in short, he does not, with the least possible postponement, and at whatever risk, go straight and heartily forward to the attainment of the ends to which he is solemnly betrothed; then we will predict that his good name, which is now illustrious and honoured among his countrymen, will be forfeited, and he will inherit the contempt and aversion which justly await the common herd of political adventurers, who make patriotic professions the stepping-stone to low ambition and sordid accumulations.

Up to the period we are writing, we have seen nothing to throw suspicion on the integrity of the lord chancellor. His speech in the Upper House, on introducing the Local Courts' Bill was as able and honest as those he has been wont to deliver in the other place.

In gliding into his great office, the late M.P. for Yorkshire exhibited some of that awkwardness,—that infirmity of judgment and impetuosity of feeling, which appear the besetting weaknesses of his organization, and which very nigh made a shipwreck of his own fame, and that of the new administration. There was evidently some hesitation among the Whig lords, in confiding the Great Seal to so rampant a genius; in the interim, the anxious expectant gave vent to expressions and declarations, which, in a few days, he falsified by his conduct, to the great amazement of many foolish people, who look to words rather than the immutable nature of things for the index of human proceedings. Now all this was gratuitous folly and exposure. Had the great advocate and prime cock of his

party taken a more sober view of his position,—had he kept his long tongue quiet only a few days, and patiently waited the denouement of events, the great prize about which he felt so feverish would have been laid at his feet. Who, indeed, could claim precedence of himself in the chancellorship? Lord Lyndhurst was properly disowned for indolence and want of application to acquire the needful knowledge of equity; at the Chancery-bar there was none of sufficient political mark and distinction; common-sergeant Denman was out of the question; Plunket had sold himself to the enemy; and Scarlett had been guilty of a similar delict; and, besides, is a mere Fig-court lawyer, wedded to technicalities, wasting his vacations in conning over the points and particles of his Horace and Anacreon, to prepare puzzles for the circuit-mess and council-room, in lieu of acquiring real knowledge to bring his mind up to the standard of the age. Who, then, we repeat, but Brougham could have the chancellorship,—the steady, but sometimes unruly partizan of twenty years' standing, the first orator and most enlightened lawyer of his time?

It is the *judgment*—and that is a matter of moment in a judge—more than any thing else we distrust in the noble and learned lord, and if he do not bring his resolves to wait on a more patient discretion, it is probable his chancellorship will be signalized by some very unusual eccentricities. It is already rumoured that his lordship has divested himself of ecclesiastical patronage, and left the disposal of the benefices in his gift to the bishops of the dioceses in which they are situated. If this be correct, we will venture to say it is one of those sudden spurts of magnanimity and disinterestedness of which he by this time repents. It is well known no portion of church patronage is so selfishly misapplied as that of the prelates;—to be sure, the lawn sleeves, who always manifest so lively a sense of whatever favours their secular interests, may be brought over by the concession; but, upon the whole, we should rather fear the application of the old proverb, in reference to the inveteracy of theological antipathies.

But what course will his lordship pursue, in respect of the reform of his own court? Will he forthwith proceed to disintegrate the mass of incompatible duties which concentrate in the office of lord chancellor? Will he, at once, remove the obvious obstacles to a prompt administration of justice in equity, by cutting off the bankruptcy jurisdiction, by individualizing the judicial functions of the judge; and will he effect a still further improvement by putting an end to the monstrous anomaly of the supremacy of the legal department being the invariable prize of successful political partizanship,—the reward of the best debater in the House of Commons, who happens to be a barrister, though otherwise without peculiar fitness for the appointment, either from individual character or previous professional pursuits?

The solution of these and other enigmas will either confirm the old or give a new reading to the noble lord's character. There is a curious anecdote in circulation, with respect to the offer of the mastership of the rolls, during the premiership of Mr. Canning; but this, together with several other arrows in our quiver, we shall reserve till his lordship has had time to develop. We repeat we have discerned nothing to impair public confidence, and we fervently trust that the baron of Vaux, under every mutation of name and dignity, will be able, to the end of his career, without reproach, to bear on his crest the motto—*Semper idem*.

Brown, W. R. cocket-writer, customs

Brown, N. commissioner, victualling-office	£800
Brown, Thomas, master-attendant, Woolwich	650
Browne, Charles, under-secretary, excise	800
Browne, P. secretary and charge d'affaires at Copenhagen ..	1151
Browne, lieut.-gen. G. colonel 44th foot, pay (exclusive of clothing emoluments)	613
Browne, R. solicitor to the stamp-board, Ireland	2000
Browne, R. late teller of exchequer, <i>Aug.</i> 1824	400
Late commissioner of musters, 1798	151
Browne, sir H. pension on c.l. 1829	200
Brown, R. examiner of army accounts	1200
Half-pay as deputy commissary-general, 1807	273
Agent for paying retired or officiating chaplains	250
Allowance as private secretary to a secretary of war.	150
Brooking, A. H. collector of customs, Newfoundland	1400
Brownrigg, gen. sir R. colonel 9th foot, pay and emoluments .	1323
Governor of Landguard fort	339
Pension from Ceylon	1000
Brandling, J. receiver-general of taxes, Durham and North- umberland	600
Brooksbank, Stamp, clerk in the treasury and auditor of treasury accounts	1650
Brooksbank, T. C. chief clerk in treasury	1200
Agent and paymaster of Chelsea out-pensioners	750
Agent for the Bahamas	150
As late commissioner of lottery	150
Brooksbank, Ann, pension on c.l. 1783	155
Brooksbank, Elizabeth, Isabella, and Hermoine, ditto 1827 ..	300
Brooke, R. clerk in customs, Liverpool	500
Bromley, lady Louisa, (late Dawson,) pension out of 4½ per cent. duties, <i>Nov.</i> 1820	250
Bruce, sir S. pension on c.l. 1817	177
Bryce, major-gen. sir A. colonel commandant royal engineers, and deputy inspector-general of fortifications	1875
Pension for good services	182
Brydges, sir John W. H. uncle-in-law of marquis of Water- ford, and M.P. for Coleraine; a major in the army, capt. of Sandgate-castle, and colonel in the Portu- guese service	no return.

The city of London has had a brush with the Beresfords, as well as Mr. O'Connell, and, last election, attempted to rescue from their monopolizing grasp the borough of Coleraine. The borough is indebted for its charter to the corporation of London; they are the proprietors of the soil, and endowed it with upwards of 400 acres of land, for the general benefit of the inhabitants. By some means the Beresfords have contrived to render the common council a *select* body, consisting of the members of their own family and dependents, through whose agency, for upwards of a century, they have returned the parliamentary representative. For the last fifteen years sir John

Brydges has been their nominee; and, at the general election, the gallant knight, for the first time, went to pay his respects to his constituents, when, in answer to the inquiries of the townspeople, he told them "that, though he had never before been amongst them, and was an Englishman, he had an *Irish heart*." Some of the inhabitants claimed the right to which they are entitled by the charter, to the exercise of the elective franchise, and objected to the Major being returned by about twenty non-resident burgesses. These claims and objections were over-ruled by the worshipful mayor; and, after the usual farce of a nomination by a clergyman, and a seconding by another corporate official, the captain of Sandgate-castle, and colonel in the service of Don Miguel, was declared duly elected to the imperial parliament. The corporation of London have protested against these proceedings of the Beresford puppets, and expressed their intention, by a deputation of their body, to re-establish, in a court of law, the general rights of the burgess agreeably to their charter. It is probable, however, their laudable endeavours will be rendered unnecessary by a general legislative measure, which will at once cut off such rotten concerns as Coleraine, Truro, Berealston, and scores more. They have had their day, and enacted their part for the last time, or, at most, last but one.

Buchanan, lady Janet, pension on c. l. <i>Oct.</i> 1827	£150
Buchanan, Susanna, pension on c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1827	200
Burton, W. W. puisne-judge, Cape of Good Hope	1500
Bull, John, clerk of journals and papers, house of commons; salary and emoluments	1656
Buller, James, retired allowance as late commis. of customs..	1100
This gentleman, we are told, a mild, amiable person, possessed the borough or boroughs of East and West Looe; therefore, disposing of his seats to the government, was made a commissioner of the customs; was unfortunately attacked with deafness; marries; is tired of London; retires to the country; makes room for some other <i>protégé</i> of government; and saddles the country with a pension of £1100.	
Bulley, A. clerk of issues, auditor's office, <i>Oct.</i> 1822	750
Receiver of pensions and officers' duties	108
Allowance on moneys paid into Exchequer	144
Burgh, Ann, pension on civil list 1794	184
Burgh, Elizabeth, pension on c. l.	276
Burgh, Catherine, pension on c. l.	230
Burke, J. clerk of crown quit-rents, Dublin	461
Burke, executors of Mrs., pension on the 4½ per cent. fund..	2500
We have touched on this notorious abuse at p. 129, and shall here pass it over.	
Bushe, C. K. chief justice of the king's bench, Ireland	5076
Bursey, J. inspector in the audit-office	600
Burrows, Peter, commis. for relief of insolvent debtors, Ireland	2092
Burraud, Rev. G. compensation allowance for loss of the office of searcher in the customs	1100
Some boroughmongering job this, no doubt; otherwise, no clergyman could have held the office of <i>searcher</i> in the customs.	
Burrard, Hannah, pension on c. l. 1815	400

Butler, G. chief clerk, ordnance department.....	£900
Butcher, J. store-keeper in the ordnance, Dublin.....	750
Burghersh, Lord, envoy and minister plenipo. at Florence ..	3900
His lordship is receiving a large salary as envoy at Florence, while he has been spending the winter in London, busily engaged in bringing out his new opera.	
Burgoyne, J. lieut.-col. royal engineers, 1814	330
Extra pay, commanding royal engineers, Portsmouth ..	165
Allowance for servant.....	27
Pension for good services, 1817.....	182
Burnell, Dr. W. commissioner, victualling-office	1000
Burton, Charles, third justice of the king's bench, Ireland ..	3692
Burton, T. allowance as late secretary to board of excise	1500
Burton, gen. N. C. col. 60th foot (1st batt.).....	1331
Butterwich, M. registrar of deeds, Yorkshire	650
Byham, R. secretary to the board of ordnance	1400
Byng, F. clerk in foreign secretary's office	903
Byng, lieut.-gen. right hon. sir J. col. 29th foot	793
Commanding in Ireland, staff-pay and emoluments ..	3607
Byng, hon. E. commissioner, colonial audit-office.....	1000
Calvert, J. M.P. for Huntington; sec. to the lord chamberlain	1332
Camden, marquess, one of the four tellers of the exchequer ..	2700
The great sinecures being about to be attacked, in 1817, the marquis resigned the fees and emoluments of his office, amounting to upwards of £25,000, retaining only the regulated salary of £2500. Previously to this his lordship contributed large sums to the public service. In 1819, the house of commons tendered a tardy vote of thanks for this munificent offering. An expectation was entertained, which is not yet realized, that the patriotic example would have been followed by the Grenvilles, the Ardens, the Bathursts, and other great sinecurists. Had the registrar of the admiralty court surrendered the emoluments of his office, for the last half century, he would have done more, we imagine, to quench the fires in the county, of which he is lord lieutenant, than by getting up magisterial resolutions to put down the incendiaries.	
Cameron, lady, pension on c. l. Dec. 1819	500
Cameron, maj.-gen. sir J. commanding western district	691
Unattached pay as major	310
Lieutenant-governor of Plymouth	493
Pension for injuries received in the service	300
Cane, Richard, sub-agent, Ireland, for Chelsea hospital	1650
Agent to yeomanry corps, ditto	461
Agent to constabulary police, ditto.....	461
Capper, J. H. clerk for criminal business in the home-depart.	670
Superintendent of convict establishment.....	400
Carter, M. consul at Coquimbo	1254
Cartwright, T. secretary and minister plenipo. at the Hague ..	1638
Cartwright, John, consul-general at Constantinople	1600
Carr, hon. Jane, (late Perceval) pension by act of parliament.	2000
Our readers may have read or heard of a mild, specious, cold-	

hearted, self-complacent minister—exactly of the Addington impress—named Spencer Perceval: this pension was granted to his widow, who, within the *annum luctus*, forgot her little lawyer, and married major Carr, of the guards. Some of the minister's children have been well provided for in the public offices; and in political demeanour, present no contrast to their parent.

Carr, Morton, solicitor to excise, Scotland	£1500
Campbell, major-gen. sir J. staff at Grenada, staff pay	828
Governor of Grenada, pay and emoluments	3775
Unattached pay as major-general	310
Campbell, lieut.-gen. sir H. commissioner of taxes	1000
Military pay in 1829	1294
Campbell, sir A. late lord of session, Scotland	1950
Campbell, Patrick, sec. and chargé d'affaires in Colombia ..	3125
Campbell, D. retired allowance as registrar of forfeitures, Ireland	276
Ditto as commissioner of military accounts, Ireland ..	367
Pension on Irish civil list	266
Accountant to board of general officers	130
A servant of all work, this, at the Castle, and the work there has been mostly <i>black jobs</i> .	
Campbell, gen. A. col. 3d foot, pay and emoluments	1351
Campbell, D. inspecting commander of customs, Aberdeen ..	344
Captain in the navy	191
Campbell, major-gen. sir C. commanding south-west district ..	691
Unattached pay as major in the coldstream guards	500
Governor of Portsmouth	168
Campbell, John, comptroller of customs, Greenock	600
Campbell, gen. D. col. 91st foot, pay and emoluments	1241
Campbell, Alexander, commissioner of excise	1400
Campbell, Eliza, pension on civil list	389
Campbell, Mary, pension on civil list, <i>Sept.</i> 1810	200
Campbell, Mrs. A. pension out of 4½ per cent. <i>July</i> 1820 ..	219
Campbell, sir Ilay, of Succoth, late president of the court of session	3225
Campbell, Thomas, pension on civil list, <i>Oct.</i> 1806	184

Really the Campbells are a host! We find them in all offices and departments, and in all parts of the world. Those enumerated are only part of the clan. The last we always took to be the author of the celebrated *Pleasures of Hope*. Mr. Campbell's pension, we believe, was given to him by his friends, the WHIGS, but we never could learn by what "high and efficient *public services*" he became entitled to it. If it were bestowed when Mr. C. was a *poor*, but elegant scholar, and man of genius, well and good; we do not grudge the boon, had it been five times the amount.

Canning, H. consul-general at Hamburgh	1836
Canning, sir Stratford, ambassador at Constantinople	4460
Canning, trustees for the family of the late Mr., pension, by act of parliament	3000

The life of the late Mr. Canning was undistinguished by public virtue, and at his death he merited no public reward. He was an open corruptionist and trimmer for place; his political principles

were superficial and aristocratic ; and by his abilities—specious sophistry, and tinsel eloquence—he kept up a party which inflicted on the country incalculable evils. The friends who deserted him <i>knew</i> him ; they hated and feared him.	
Case, G. receiver-gen. of taxes, part of Lancaster	£600
Carter, Thomas, provost-marshal, Barbadoes	1500
Cathcart, earl of, late ambassador at Petersburg	1784
Colonel of 2d life guards	1816
Vice-admiral of Scotland	1015
Cathcart, Elizabeth, baroness, pension on civil list, 1798	389
Caithness, Jean, countess of, pension on c. l. <i>July</i> 1800	200
Additional pension, c. l. <i>July</i> 1802	100
Additional, c. l. <i>Sept.</i> 1825	100
Cavan, gen. the earl of, col. 45th foot, pay	613
Governor of Calshot-castle	43
Pension on civil list, <i>June</i> 1796.....	260
Chapman, J. commissioner of audit	1200
Chapman, col. S. R. secretary and registrar, Gibraltar.....	1200
Chapman, J. allowance as late clerk in colonial-office	1100
Late clerk of council, Trinidad	1427
Chad, G. W. foreign minister in Colombia.....	2787
Charsley, W. assistant clerk in tally-office.....	500
Compensation for loss of office in <i>tally cutting</i>	150
Junior clerk in tally-office	133
For labour in <i>locking up the king's treasure</i> , Oct. 1826	40
Christie, col. sir Arch. unattached pay as colonel of 1st royal veteran battalion	501
Commandant of Chatham depot	726
Pension for wounds.....	600
Chamberlain, sir H. consul at Rio (to 5th June, 1830).....	1041
Champagne, gen. Josiah, col. 17th foot	1315
Chambers, R. J. police justice, Union Hall	800
Commissioner of bankrupts, 1803	350
Chatham, earl of, governor of Gibraltar.....	4000
Receives also military allowances, and is col. of 4th foot.	
In trust for seven children of lady Lucy R. Taylor, out of 4½ per cent. Leeward Island duties, for each	139
Chowne, lieut.-gen. C. colonel 76th foot	1321
Christian, J. assistant inspector-gen. of customs, Dublin	400
Commander in the navy	182
Church, John, late clerk in navy pay office, <i>March</i> 1822....	292
Clerk in stationery-office, <i>Jan.</i> 1808	600
Christmas, C. G. deputy auditor for land revenue	2193
See Sir W. Cooper.	
Clarendon, earl of, chief justice in Eyre, North of Trent	2250
Prothonotary county palatine of Durham	450

Clare, dowager lady, and lady Fitzgibbon, pension on c. l. 1830	£780
Clarke, gen. sir Alured, col. 7th foot, pay and emoluments ..	1153
Clarke, rev. Dr. receiver of clergy returns, <i>Jan.</i> 1804	500
Late auditor of the royal naval asylum	300
Clark, E. H. clerk of the warrants, customs	2682
Clerk, John, late lord of session, Scotland	1500
Clifden, viscount, clerk of the privy council, Ireland	1450
Clancarty, earl of, late ambassador to the Netherlands	2000
Clanricarde, marquis, captain of yeomen of guard	1341
Claypon, B. receiver-gen. of taxes, Lincoln	600
Clancey, James, taxing officer in common law business, Ireland	1107
Clarina, Penelope, baroness, pension on c. l. <i>March</i> 1813 ..	333
Clinton, lieut.-gen. sir W. H. col. 55th foot, pay, and cloth- ing emoluments	1109
Clifton, M. W. secretary to the victualling-board	1000
Clogstone, S. M. collector of customs, Trinidad	1500
Cochrane, Maria, lady, pension on civil list, <i>Oct.</i> 1800	300
Cochrane, sir T. governor of Newfoundland	3000
Cockburn, Henry, solicitor-general, Scotland	2000
Cockburn, A. late minister to Wurtemberg	1700
Cockburn, sir Geo. M.P. admiral and major-gen. of marines..	1630
Cockburn, Fanny, Mary, and Harriet, c. l. 1791, each	100
Cockburn, dame Augusta, pension on civil list	358
Cockburn, Marianne, pension on civil list, 1800	115
Cockburn, Augusta Harriett, pension on civil list, 1827	200
Cockburn, dame Mary, pension on civil list, 1825	680
Cockane, Barbara, pension on c. l. <i>June</i> 1798	230
Codd, major-gen. superintendent, Honduras	1200
Coke, Elizabeth Ann, pension on c. l. <i>Jan.</i> 1818	100
Colchester, lord, hereditary pension, by act of parliament	3000
The father of this lord was speaker of the house of commons for many years with a sufficiently large salary, and held till death the valuable sinecure of keeper of the privy seal, Ireland. He was a shuffling, time-serving lawyer, and the vote of censure on his conduct, moved by lord W. Russell, stands recorded on the journals of the house. Were not such a person adequately rewarded in his life-time, and ought the country to be burthened with a pension to his heir?	
Coleridge, John Taylor, commissioner of bankrupts	350
Colman, George, examiner of plays	400
Lieut. of the yeomen of the guard	350

Besides the military duties of this court functionary, his business is to examine theatrical pieces before they are licensed for representation, by the Lord Chamberlain, and in the discharge of this office he has latterly acquired considerable notoriety by his captious and puritanical expurgation of what he considered objectionable passages. The truth seems to be that Mr. Colman, in his old age, has turned *Methodist*. In his early years he had been a great sinner; as is evinced in his merry tale of *Two Parsons and One Shirt, My Chaste Night Gown and Slipper, the Modest Lady of*

the Wreck, his Poetical Vagaries, &c. The author of these morceaux, we are now told, cannot bear an expletive in a play without shuddering, that he actually turns up the white of his eyes on an exclamation of O heaven! in a tragedy, and that a double entendre throws him into convulsions. Poor old Chaucer underwent a similar conversion in his latter days. It is time, however, the office was abolished; it is too much that talent and genius should be subject to the hypochondriacal whims of repentant prodigals.

Colborne, major-gen. sir J. lieutenant-governor, Upper Canada ..	£3000
Cowper, earl, hereditary pension out of excise revenue	1600

Here we have a most singular instance of the application of the revenue. The present noble lord holds it as an inheritance, acquired by the marriage of his grandfather with the heiress of the son of general Overkerken, created lord Grantham. This general was greatly distinguished in the wars of the duke of Marlborough; but whether the pension was granted by king William for the services of the father, or for a loan of money from the son, is not known, no document being extant to establish it; but this pension has been made part of the family settlements of the noble earl, who succeeded to it at his brother's death, as he did to his estates: he may dispose of it at his pleasure. The present possessor, in his political life, has been distinguished by high liberalism, and the most perfect independence. Though frequently invited to Windsor, he was never influenced by it, or ever swerved from his public duty. In the examination of votes, his will be found to have been correctly given. As an *inheritance*, his Lordship cannot be blamed for drawing this sum regularly from the public purse; but it becomes the duty of ministers to make arrangements with the noble earl for the extinction of this pension. He is entitled to some compensation; but yet his vested right in it is not such that he can look for so many years' purchase as if it were a landed property. No improvement has been made—no outlay incurred; and what was apparently so lavishly given, and has been so long enjoyed, may be resumed, with some regard to the present times and the general interests of the country.

—*Correspondent of the Times, Dec. 15, 1830.*

Cowley, lord, late ambassador at Vienna	2500
Cole, B. and W. Herbert Mullens, stock-brokers for national debt office	750
Combermere, gen. viscount, colonel 1st life guards, pay and emoluments	1800
Governor of Sheerness	200
Pension, by act of parliament	2000
Congreve, dame Isabella, pension on civil list, 1829	311
Conway, lord H. S. and lord R. S. Conway, late prothonotaries of the court of king's bench, Ireland	7137
Corbett, C. H. assistant secretary, excise	600
Cooper, George, assistant surveyor, customs	1093
Cooper, sir W. H. and sir F. G. auditor for land revenue in England, salary and emoluments, in year 1829	4071
This is a patent office, held for the lives and life of the survivor; the former is a clergyman, and sir F. G. Cooper was lately an officer in the guards.	
Cooper, J. S. comptroller-general of stamps, Ireland	900

Cooke, lieut.-general sir G. col. 77th foot	£1249
Pension for wounds	350
Cooke, Frances, pension on civil list, 1821	200
Cooke, Eliza, pension on civil list, 1793	135
Cornwall, Jos. collector of excise, Edinburgh	600
Cornwall, J. warehouse-keeper, excise, Dublin	600
Cole, lieut.-gen. sir G. L. governor of Cape of Good Hope ..	7000
Cope, Walter, consul at Guayaquil	1033
Cotton, William, chief clerk in the treasury	1400
Colles, Joseph, clerk to registrar in chancery	1447
Collingwood, hon. S. pension on consolidated fund	500
Colville, E. D. registrar in chancery	2759
Colby, lieut.-col. F. lieut.-col. royal engineers	384
Extra pay for survey of Great Britain	495
Superintendent of the trigonometrical survey, Ireland ..	500
Conant, J. E. police justice, Great Marlborough-street	800
Conyngham, G. Lenox, seventh senior clerk in foreign office..	695
Corry, James, late sec. to linen board, Ireland	616
Late clerk of the journals, Irish house of lords	609
Colville, lieut.-gen. sir C. governor of Mauritius	8000
Courtenay, right hon. T. P. agent for Cape of Good Hope ..	600
Pension under 57 Geo. III. 1825	1000
Courtenay, T. P. in trust for Elizabeth, Catharine, and Frances	
Courtenay, pensions on civil list, <i>Sept.</i> 1806	1000
Courtenay, Ann, pension on civil list, 1827	300
Connor, Edw. clerk in secretary's office, Dublin	923
Compensation for losses at the union	161
Pension, <i>May</i> 1819	184
Allowance on abolition of office of sec. to board of	
general officers, <i>Dec.</i> 1823	92
Connor, R. master in chancery, Ireland	3323
Pension as late clerk, Irish house of commons	55
Conroy, sir John, late commis. colonial audit-office, <i>July</i> 1824	800
Captain on half-pay, royal artillery, <i>June</i> 1822	
Cox, S. C. master in chancery, for year ending <i>June</i> 5, 1830	3994
Court, C. T. accountant-general, post-office	700
Cointe, J. F. Le, clerk to registrar in chancery	1230
Craigie, Robert, lord of session, Scotland	2000
Crafer, Thomas, clerk assistant to secretaries, Treasury	1100
Paymaster of American loyalists	300
Cranstoun, G. lord of session, Scotland	2000
Cranstoun, lady, pension on civil list, <i>July</i> , 1826	100
Cranstoun, lady, pension on c. l. <i>Aug.</i> 1826	100
Cranstoun, Edward lord, ditto c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1821	200
Crocker, J. accountant to medical board	350
Croomes, John lord, clerk and assistant-clerk of estimates,	
war-office	393

Croke, A. LL.D. pension on the consolidated fund	£1000
Croker, Rosamond, pension on civil list, 1827	300
Croker, right hon. John Wilson, pension under 57 Geo. III. May, 1826	1500

In a recent pamphlet, imputed to this veteran placeman, written in answer to two pamphlets, imputed to lord Brougham, but no more like Brougham's than Hyperion to a Satyr, and much more like the flippant production of some lawyerling, with his pockets stuffed with bankrupts' fees, looking greedily forward to the Rolls, a solicitor-generalship, or some other prize of party-subserviency. Well, in this pamphlet, Croker—for it must be his, it is so like him—actually resorts to the old bugbear of *property being in danger!* But this, we can assure him, will never do; people do not now believe in stories of ghosts and hobgoblins; we doubt even, whether the alarm of a revolution would frighten them. So much have the times altered. Thanks to the *three days!* Spoliation, massacre, and infidelity are no longer associated with resistance to tyranny! What, indeed, have political reforms to do with private property? they are only directed against public men and public abuses; they are the storms which agitate for a moment the upper regions, while all beneath remains secure and tranquil. But why do we talk thus? There is no apprehension of revolution in this country, no more than there is of the security of property. The rt. hon. ex-secretary could not mean so; the property he meant, no doubt, was pensions and sinecures; or, perhaps, the lease of the crown-land he obtained for the erection of a mansion on the site of Carlton-house, to which he purposes hereafter to retire from the retreat in Kensington-palace, to enjoy in dignified leisure his official gatherings.

Croft, Wm. chief clerk ordnance department	900
Croft, F. Master in chancery for year ending Jan. 1830	3799
Crokat, C. examiner of spoiled stamps	500
Crompton, J. receiver-general of taxes, Derby	500
Cumberland, lady Albinia, a pension on civil list, 1794	311
Cumming, Ann, pension on civil list, 1822	200
Cust, hon. W. commissioner of customs	1400

Most of these commissioners of customs, excise, stamps, and taxes are *honorables*. The amount of their salaries is shamefully extravagant, and we believe it was the Duke's intention to reduce them.

Cuppige, lieut.-gen. W. col. commandant royal artillery, and inspector of royal carriage department, Woolwich ..	1430
Cunningham, C. late commissioner of the navy	981
Cuthbert, G. W. assistant-secretary, national debt-office	600
Curtis, Jos. distributor of sea-policy stamps	500
D'Aeth, G. W. H. receiver-general of taxes, Kent	600
Dakins, Rev. W. W. assistant chaplain-general	210
Chaplain to the forces serving in London, March, 1810 ..	292
Dalbiac, major-gen. unattached pay as lieut.-col.	419
Staff pay as major-gen.	690
Dampier, John L. commissioner of bankrupts, 1819	350
Recorder of Portsmouth, 1829	
Dashwood, Charles, consul at Guatemala	1500

Davis, Hart, commissioner of excise	£1400
Day, W. keeper of criminal registers, home department, and conductor of the police horse patrol establishment	480
Keeper of the accounts, <i>April</i> , 1805	450
Day, C. late justice of the king's bench, Ireland	2400
Darling, lieut.-gen., governor-in-chief of New South Wales ..	4200
Daly, S. G. late justice of king's bench, Ireland	2344
Dawkins, E. J. resident in Greece	2900
Dawkins, H. commissioner of woods and forests	1200
Dawkins, R. retired allowance as commissioner of excise	1050
Dawson, lady A. M. pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund	250
Davis, T. H. surveyor-general, customs	800
Dancer, J. N. one of examiners in chancery; salary and emo- luments for year ending <i>Jan. 5</i> , 1830	1600
Darlot, H. deputy comptroller, post-office	814
D'Aguilar, George, brevet lieut.-col., assistant adjutant-gen. Major halfpay 91st foot, <i>Sept.</i> 1821	346 168
Allowance for mustering life and foot guards	100
Dehany, W. K. solicitor to the excise, in lieu of bills	2500
De Haekel, J. P. and Ann Ernesline, pension c. l. 1813	200
Delavaud, Geo. retired allowance as late secretary of customs	1500
Dealtry, P. king's clerk, crown-office, salary	30
Secondary clerk in court, clerk of the affidavits, and chief usher, court of king's bench; fees	1672
Dew, E. examiner of dry goods, customs	2141
Dean, R. B. chairman of the board of customs	2000
clerk to master in chancery, alienation office	50
Dean, Mary and Laura, pension on civil list, 1830	300
Delamotte, W. master of landscape drawing, military college	300
Denman, sir Thomas, M.P. for Nottingham, attorney-general	6200
Desbrow, lieut.-col., capt. and lieut.-col. of grenadier guards	494
Assistant to the general commanding in chief	600
D'Este, col. pension civil list, 1830	467
D'Este, Miss, pension civil list, 1830	467
Dejoncourt, S. clerk of Connaught-road	724
Devonshire, duke of, lord chamberlain of the household	3058
Disney, lieut.-gen. sir M. colonel 15th foot	1272
Dickson, Jane, Caroline, and Louisa, each, c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1806 ..	100
Dickinson, A. assistant clerk of the journals, house of commons	1304
Disbrowe, E. C. envoy extra. and min. plen. at Stutgard	3300
Dickson, lieut.-col. sir A. lieut.-col. royal horse artillery, and deputy adj.-gen. royal artillery	1350
Pension for good services	365
Disbrowe, lieut.-col. assistant military secretary, <i>Feb.</i> 1806 ..	600
Lieut.-col. grenadier guards, <i>July</i> , 1828	477
Dixon, col. W. col. commandant royal artillery	1003
Dickie, Jos. paymaster, Belfast	551

Doherty, John, chief justice common pleas, Ireland	£4615
D'Olier, Isaac, secretary first fruits office, Ireland	313
Dowding, C. inspector-general of customs, Liverpool	700
Dowdeswell, T. E., M. P. for Tewkesbury; a master in chancery for year ending <i>Jan.</i> 1830	3896
Donne, E. solicitor to commissioners of hackney coaches	1636
Dorington, J. E. parliamentary agent to the English and Irish departments of the treasury	1100
Donkin, lieut.-gen. sir R. S. col. 80th foot	1412
Downes, col. lord, unattached pay as lieut.-colonel	200
Secretary to the master-general of the ordnance.....	1200
Don, gen. sir G. col. 3d foot, pay and emoluments	1318
Lieutenant-governor of Gibraltar	4211
Donoughmore, gen. earl of, col. 18th foot.....	1258
Governor of Stirling Castle	857
Pension for military services	2000
A meritorious officer, but with his other emoluments, and possessed of a large inheritance, he would bear reduction. The presumptive heir to the honours and pension, the late captain Hutchinson, of the guards, distinguished himself in assisting the escape of the French general Lavalette. But all hereditary rewards are objectionable, except such as history accords.	
Donne, J. G. clerk privy-seal office, <i>July</i> , 1823	300
Surveyor of hawkers' licenses, <i>July</i> , 1827	100
Doyle, sir F. H. deputy chairman, excise board	1700
Deputy lieutenant of the Tower	786
Doyle, gen. sir John, bart. colonel 87th foot.....	1228
Governor of Charlemont.....	665
Douglas, col. sir J. lieut.-col. of Portuguese army, half-pay..	200
Deputy quarter-master-general in Ireland	746
Inspector of army clothing	346
Pension for loss of leg	350
Douglas, sir Howard, lieutenant-governor of New Brunswick	2900
Dombrain, Jos. inspector-general of coast guard, Dublin	800
Dorchester, lady, pension on consolidated fund	1000
Ditto on civil list.....	115
Drake, Mr. clerk to master Dowdeswell, whom see	1426
Drake, gen. dep. commissary in the West Indies	1317
Drinkwater, lieut.-col. comptroller of army accounts.....	1500
Late commissary-general	525
Drummond, rev. Charles Edward, c. l. <i>Sept.</i> 1822	100
Drummond, Edw. late private secretary to the duke of Wellington, who, on the resignation of the premier, placed him on the court pension list	250
Drummond, Percy, colonel royal artillery, 1827	474
lieut.-governor royal military academy, Woolwich, 1829	400
Forage and servant allowance	127
Duncan, viscount, hereditary pension by act of parliament....	3000

Dunglass, lord, chamberlain of Ettrick forest	£300
Durham, lord, lord privy seal.....	2193
Another son-in-law of earl Grey, another Whig, and another useless office. The privy seal must be a superfluous office, if not an absolute sinecure, and cannot be necessary in addition to the sign manual, signet, and great seal, to give authenticity to public documents. But, we presume, it forms one more of those costly appendages of monarchy, which, like the mysteries of faith, and lord Brougham's wig and train, must not be too closely investigated.	
Durell, Martha, pension on c. l. <i>Aug.</i> 1810.....	500
Dutton, W. C. minute-clerk, customs	600
D'Urban, sir B. lieut.-governor, Demerara	5877
D'Urban, W. J. government secretary, Demerara	1596
Duntze, sir J. bart. receiver-general of taxes, Devon	600
Dundas, lady Elizabeth, pension on c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1801.....	300
Dundas, William, M.P. for Edinburgh, and cousin of viscount Melville; lord clerk register, keeper of the signet, and register of sasines, Scotland	5000
Dundas, dame Charlotte, pension civil list, 1812	780
Dundas, rear-adm. hon. G. H. L. lord of the admiralty	1000
Duff, lieut.-gen. Hon. Alex. M.P. for Elgin, col. 92d foot..	1307
Durnford, col. E. colonel commanding royal engineers, Canada	1195
Dunlop, lieut.-gen. colonel 75th foot.....	1135
Durell, Patty, pension on c. l. 1825	100
Dwyer, F. late six clerk, chancery, Ireland	1088
Dyer, H. M. police justice, Great Marlborough-street	800
Dyer, H. M. pension out of consolidated fund.....	1000
Dyer, John, chief clerk in the admiralty	1150
Dyer, John, receiver of receipts of customs	1824
Dyke, P. A. collector of customs, Ceylon	1343
Dyson, Jeremiah, George, and Henry, or survivor, c. l.	893
Dyneley, Charles, deputy-register, prerogative court of Canterbury; from fees	1193
Dyneley, John, secretary of presentations to lord chancellor..	750
Commissioner of bankrupts	350
Dyott, lieut.-gen. Wm. col. 63d foot, pay and emoluments..	1245
Earl, E. retired allowance as commissioner of customs	1500
Earle, P. H. assistant clerk in the treasury, <i>July</i> , 1802....	689
Retired commissioner of lottery, <i>March</i> , 1827	133
Earnshaw, W. assistant solicitor of customs.....	1500
Ebbs, John, clerk, privy council office, Dublin	659
Compensation for wine-warrants, <i>Jan.</i> 1828.....	35
Usher and keeper of council chamber, <i>March</i> , 1828..	266
Clerk in military department of chief secretary	184
Compensation for losses at the union.....	65
Eden, Hon. R. H. master in chancery, for year 1830.....	4644
Eden, Emily and Frances, pension on civil list, 1818, each ..	203
Edwardes, Jas. head distributor of stamps, Scotland	900

Edwards, John, retired allowance as solicitor of excise	£1292
Edwards, dep. commissary general in Jamaica	1040
Edgcombe, J. collector of customs, Newcastle	700
Edgcombe, F. commissioner, victualling office	800
Elderton, M. clerk to Master Wingfield, whom see.	1476
Eldon, lord, pension out of consolidated fund	4000

The patriarch of the Pitt and plunder system has survived to witness the final issues of his politics. All the calamities under which the country is suffering are the consequences of the war, of the burthens it entailed, and of the cessation of those dram-shop expedients, which were "strength in the beginning, but weakness in the end." The politicians of this school must have had some misgivings of the soundness of their dogmas; they could not but know that there must be a limit to the magnitude of the debt, and that a load of taxes, which absorbed wages and profits, must end in general poverty and privation. But they were reckless adventurers, who looked only to the present hour, and were regardless of what the future might bring forth. Patriotism, with them, was out of the question: their objects were power and emolument. "If we," said Lord Eldon, on the trial of Mr. Perry, "by our industry, have acquired a degree of opulence and distinction which we could not reasonably have looked for, let us be thankful to *that government* to whose favour we are, in a great measure, indebted for success. And do not let us, by any rash attempt upon our constitution, put it out of the power of *our children* to rise to similar situations." (*Erskine's Speeches*, vol. ii. p. 445.) Here is a distinct avowal of the pure *selfism* which attached his Lordship to the constitution; it had *worked well for him*, and it might work well for his *children*. But how it had worked for the country, formed no part of the consideration.

Lord Eldon has seldom appeared in public of late years; these are his days of humiliation and disappointment; and recent occurrences must have been gall and wormwood to him. During the present session, his Lordship attempted to enforce his old reading of the law in respect of public meetings. He said (House of Lords, Nov. 29th) that people seemed to imagine that if they only assembled for the purpose of *begging*, they had a right to meet in any number; and then he went on to broach something like his favourite climax, in defence of the Manchester outrage, in 1819, namely, that numbers constitute force,—force, terror,—and terror, illegality; thus leaving it to the discretion of a parson-magistracy to determine what *numbers* and what *force* shall be deemed a sufficient pretext for dispersing and slaughtering an unarmed multitude. Oh, for some troops of yeomanry cavalry to execute this old man's legal dicta; but even the farmers seem more bent on cutting down something ELSE than the people!

Elgin, earl of, late ambassador to the Ottoman Porte	2000
Also, as lieutenant-general	595
Elibank, Alexander Murray, pension on civil list, 1826	150
Elibank, lady, pension on civil list, 1830	138
Elphinstone, lord, pension on c. l. Feb. 1814	150
Ditto, additional, Aug. 1826	150
Ellenborough, lord, chief clerk of court of king's bench	9625

This amphibious lord is, also, *custos brevium* of the king's bench; an office held jointly with Lord Kenyon, who receives the emolument

during his life. Both offices were given to Lord Ellenborough by his father, the late high prerogative judge. Justice may well be dear when fees can be levied on suitors to support such monstrous judicial sinecures.	
Elley, major-gen. J. col. 17th light dragoons, pay	£580
Governor of Galway	348
Pension for wounds	300
Ellicombe, C. G. lieut.-col. royal engineers, <i>May</i> , 1825 ..	720
Allowance for house-rent, forage, and servants.....	182
Brigade major, <i>Jan.</i> 1821	182
Ellice, Edward, brother-in-law of earl Grey, and M.P. for Coventry ; secretary to the treasury	3500
Ellis, hon. Agar, first commissioner of woods and forests....	2000
Ellis, H. clerk of the pells in the exchequer (a sinecure)....	1400
Ellis, Thomas, master in chancery, Ireland	3323
Elliot, H. secretary to military boards	600
Elliott, H. late minister to the two Sicilies	2000
Elliott, hon. Geo. secretary to the admiralty	3000
Emmett, brevet-major A. captain, royal engineers, 1825....	238
Extra commanding engineers, at Manchester	119
Allowance for a servant	27
Pension for a wound, 1817	100
Emerson, J. commander of post-office packet, Liverpool,	400
Master in the navy, <i>March</i> , 1810	109
Englebach, L. G. inspector in audit-office, 1806	600
Inspector of foreign department, 1822	100
Erskine, lord, envoy and plenipotentiary at Munich.....	4900
Erskine, Euphemia, Helen, and Marianne, each, c. l.	50
Erskine, lady Louisa, pension on c. l. <i>March</i> , 1801	100
Erskine, Mrs. widow of H. Erskine, esq. c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1818..	300
Erskine, Mary Henrietta, pension on c. l. <i>July</i> , 1797	400
Errol, earl of, pension on civil list, 1819	276
Master of horse to the queen, 1830	
Errol, countess dowager of, pension on c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1809 ...	92
Errol, Elizabeth Jemima, countess of, c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1791	300
Errol, Harriet, countess of, c. l. <i>June</i> , 1820	300
Esten, C. chief justice of Bermuda	1020
Everett, W. receiver of taxes, London and Middlesex, salary and allowances for expenses	1900
Ewart, John, Elizabeth, and Mary, each, c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1794..	121
Ewbank, Jas. general accountant, excise.....	600
Exmouth, admiral lord, pension by act of parliament	2000
Admiral in the navy	760
Falconar, John, consul at Leghorn	1144
Fane, J. T. M.P. for Lyme Regis, and relative of the earl of Westmoreland ; clerk in privy-seal office	320
Half-pay lieut.-col. in 22d dragoons, <i>Jan.</i> 1824	200

Farran, Jos. clerk of the pleas, exchequer, Ireland	£1384
Fane, lieut.-gen. sir H. M.P. for Hastings, colonel 1st dra- goon guards, pay	987
Surveyor-general of ordnance	960
Falkland, viscount, pension on civil list, <i>June</i> , 1816	200
Farnborough, lord, pension on the 4½ per cent. duties, 1801	1500
<i>Charles Long</i> , a rich man, who always held lucrative offices, with- out a family, and no claim whatever on the Barbadoes planters.	
Fagel, Louis, baron de, pension on civil list, <i>Nov.</i> 1814	130
Fall, Richard, assistant-surveyor, customs	1420
Farr, W. D. first marshal, Demerara	5100
Fabian, Robt. pension on civil list, 1828	111
Falk, Lucius Bentinck, pension on c. l. 1816	184
Fane, R. G. C. commissioner of bankrupts, 1821	350
Vice-chamberlain of Chester, 1824	
Farmer, sir Geo. R. pension on civil list, 1822	185
Farrer, Ann and Mary, pensions on c. l. 1771	311
Farrer, J. W. master in chancery	3622
Fauquier, Edward, senior clerk in the treasury	849
Superintendent of St. James's and Hyde Parks	207
Ferguson, Joseph, superintendent of mail-coaches, Ireland ..	369
Manager, money-order office, ditto	150
Fergusson, lieut.-gen. sir R. M.P. for Kirkcudbright, col. 79th foot, pay	612
Fergusson, Isabella, Mary, and Margaret, pensions on c.l. 1799	184
Fergusson, Elizabeth, pension on c. l. 1805	97
Finch, H. clerk 1st class, war-office	595
Finch, hon. and rev. E. chaplain and principal of schools, Ceylon	1070
Finch, gen. hon. E. col. 22d foot	1231
Finlaison, O. J. actuary, national-debt-office	1330
Findlay, lieut.-col. governor of Sierra Leone	2000
Fisher, major-gen. G. B. unattached general officer and com- mandant, Woolwich-garrison	1247
Fisher, Lucy, pension on c. l. 1813	136
Figg, Fanny, pension on c. l. 1829	47
Fitzwilliam, G. deputy-vendue-master, Trinidad	1500
Fitzclarence, misses, pension out of 4½ per cent. fund, <i>July</i> 1820	2500
Fitzclarence, George, pension on c. l. 1829	500
Fitzclarence, Adolphus, pension on c. l. 1829	500
Fitzclarence, colonel Frederick, pension on c. l. 1830	500

The children of the king by the late Mrs. Jordan. The husbands of the five Misses Fitzclarence are, the earl of Errol, the hon. J. E. Kennedy, (second son of earl Cassilis), Mr. P. Sidney, (only son of sir James Sidney,) the hon. col. Fox, (son of lord Holland), and lord Falkland. Augustus Fitzclarence, the ninth child of this family, is rector of Maple, Durham. These "irregular scions of an illustrious house" have, also, appointments in the royal household; and it is rumoured, though we cannot credit the report, that they are still "*clamorous*." His majesty has too much discernment, we

trust, ever to listen to overtures that would renew, in the present day, even in a remote degree, the profligate example of Charles Stuart, by rendering more conspicuous, with unearned honours and rewards, the progeny of an illicit connexion.	
Fitzhum, madam, pension on civil list, 1825	£40
Fitzgibbon, Thomas, pension on c. l. 1826	70
Fitzroy, lady Mary, pension on c. l. 1821	200
Fitzgerald, lord, late minister to Lisbon	1700
Fitzgerald, lord Robert, pension on c. l. <i>March</i> 1801	800
Fitzgibbon, R. H. brother of earl of Clare and M.P. for Limerickshire; usher and registrar of affidavits in court of chancery, Ireland	3560
Fleming, vice-adm. hon. C. E. commander-in-chief, West Indies	2555
Fleming, Jean, Elizabeth, and Catharine, pensions, each, c. l.	49
Flint, sir C. W. resident secretary, Dublin, <i>March</i> 1803 ..	1551
Comptroller of Killybegs	87
Pension on Irish c. l. <i>Oct.</i> 1815	266
Foley, lord, captain of gentlemen pensioners	1000
Fonblanque, J. G. commissioner of bankrupts, 1817	350
Forbes, doctor, superintendent of vaccine establishment, Lond.	1270
Forbes, F. chief-justice of New South Wales	2000
Forbes, J. H. lord of session, Scotland	2000
Forster, T. clerk of debentures, auditors' office	900
Foster, right hon. A. J. envoy and minister plenipo. at Turin	4249
Fox, Mrs. Bridget, lord Holland in trust for, c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1806	938

Widow of the late right hon. Charles James Fox, the idol of the Whig party. Mr. Fox was an amiable good-natured man, but a factious, mistaken, and aristocratic politician. Party had never a more devoted leader; no chieftain of banditti was more faithful to his troop than Mr. Fox, to his followers. He fought for them, apostatized for them: he would resort to any stratagem, disgrace himself with any alliance, adopt any contrivance, domineer over his sovereign, revile his minister, or court the people: and all this not for himself, for no man was more disinterested—nor for his country, for of that he thought little—but solely for the chosen few ranged under his banner. There never was a more whole-length partizan; his whole soul was devoted to the interests of his followers; beyond that circle he had neither eyes, ears, nor understanding. If Mr. Pitt's ruling passion was ambition, Burke's base lucre, the god of Mr. Fox's idolatry was party; in that "he lived, breathed, and had his being." That he should be loved by his friends, and enthusiastically admired by his followers, may be easily conceived; but that he should be held up, after the full discovery of his inconsistent and mistaken conduct, as an object of national gratitude, cannot be so readily explained.

Mr. Fox was originally bred a Tory. His conversion is ascribed to Burke, the organ of the Whig, or Rockingham party. Under his auspices he imbibed those mischievous principles, which ever after formed his political creed. The system Burke taught was briefly this:—*First*, that the House of Brunswick being indebted for the throne to the union of a few great families at the Revolution, it was *right* that these families should possess the entire control of the government. *Secondly*, for the more effectual maintenance of

this claim, it was necessary they should act in a body, so as to be able to resist the power and influence of the Crown. These two principles embrace the whole system of the Whig-school. It is evidently void of public principle; the people are excluded from consideration; it is a mere scheme for the monopoly of power and emolument. The Whigs, indeed, of that day as of this professed that *Retrenchment* and *Reform* formed also a part of their doctrines; but experience demonstrated to the country, that these were mere pretexts to catch popular support, to enable them to make head against their opponents, and that real practical Whiggism consisted in acting *en masse*, and the *divine indefeasible* right of a few superannuated nobles to govern the country.

Now, on such principles and partizanship, Mr. Fox's life was thrown away. Though he beheld the overwhelming influence of the crown, from enormous taxation, the augmentation of the peerage, and the letting in the whole tribe of contractors, money-jobbers, and paper-dealers, yet he never would cordially join in building up the democratic branch of the constitution, which they had subverted. His whole mind was contracted to party, to the augmentation of his little knot of followers, the re-union of the *New* and the *Old Whigs*; and then, when the whole, by dinners and meetings and caballing, was brought into more perfect discipline and organization—doing what? Why, forsooth, not accomplishing any great and substantial plan of reformation; but solely renewing the old war against the king; thwarting his measures, bearding him in his closet, quarrelling about the appointment of grooms and bed-chamber lords, the disposal of ribbons and garters, and rods and wands—and then, having obtained entire control of the palace, from the kitchen to the drawing-room, and placed the sovereign in that state of blessedness in which he can do no wrong, because he can do nothing; completed the grand climacteric of Whiggism!

That this is no exaggerated picture of the principles of Mr. Fox, it is only necessary to advert to his conduct in the extortion of the peerage for sir Fletcher Norton—his petulant abandonment of office, on the King's appointing the duke of Portland successor to the marquis of Rockingham—his coalition with lord North—his conduct on the regency question—and his virulent and unprincipled opposition to the early administration of Mr. Pitt. "I have heard," says Mr. Nichols, "Mr. Fox use this expression:—'Our party is formed on the principle of confederacy; ought we not then to confederate with him (lord North) who can give us the greatest strength?'"* These memorable words contain a full exposure of the utter littleness and profligacy of Mr. Fox's political system. They need no comment. He never deviated from his "principle of confederacy." Even in 1803, after his long, able, and, so far as the revolutionary war was concerned, praiseworthy opposition to Mr. Pitt, he was most anxious to unite with that minister in order to form a grand party combination. This union did not take place, solely from Mr. Pitt's reluctance to enter, after the Whig fashion, into a systematic opposition to the court. He would, however, have gone into power with Pitt on the overthrow of the Addingtonians, had not the King been "impracticable."

After the full exposure of Mr. Fox's party views, it is needless to show that he was no friend to Parliamentary Reform. "When finally separated," says Mr. Allan, "from his *old aristocratic connexions*, and convinced, from fatal experience, that the House of

* Recollections of the Reign of George III. p. 172.

Commons had sunk into the passive instrument of ministerial power, his opinion became gradually *more inclined* to Parliamentary Reform, from utter despair of seeing the revival of those *party connexions* to which he had been accustomed to look for the preservation of *public liberty*.* Here is the admission of his partial biographer, that Mr. Fox only considered Parliamentary Reform a *dernier resort*, not a great substantive measure, which alone could stem the overwhelming tide of regal, aristocratic, and moneyed influence. As to the revival of *public liberty* by *party connexions*, that language is well understood by those who have read the history of their country from the Revolution, especially of the Administration of 1806.

We shall make no further observations on Mr. Fox. How far he is entitled to the appellation of "*the Friend of the People*," the preceding observations may perhaps enable the reader to determine. Without detracting from his amiable qualities, or the great powers with which Nature had gifted him, we must be permitted to say, that he was a very objectionable statesman; and that, with the exception of the Libel Law, and the Abolition of the Slave Trade, he neither conceived nor executed a single great measure for the honour and benefit of his country. If he understood, as sir James Mackintosh says he did, the constitution, both in "an exactly legal and comprehensively philosophical sense" better than any man, and his life was a practical commentary on that knowledge; then we must say the constitution is a very different thing from what we conceived it to be. And we must also add, that if true patriotism consists in spending a long life in abortive attempts to bolster up the interests of a contemptible Oligarchy, that, too, is a thing we do not understand.

Fox, Mrs. Anne, pension on c. l. <i>Sept.</i> 1816	£276
Fortescue, J. I. receiver-general of taxes, Devon	500
Fortescue, Jane, and after her death to the misses Young, c. l.	266
Fortescue, H. postmaster, Cork	520
Fowlis, lady, pension on c. l. 1799	184
Frampson, sir Geo. F. commissioner of bankrupts, 1st list ..	450
Franklin, sir W. principal inspector, army medical board	1200
Fraser, Charlotte, Charles, and Jane, pensions on c. l. 1799 ..	389
Fraser, col. sir A. col of the royal horse artillery, and director of the royal laboratory	967
Pension for good services	182
Frere, B. late minister to the Ottoman Porte	1200
Frere, right hon. J. H. late minister of Spain	1700
Freeling, sir F. sec. to the post-office, salary and emoluments ..	4165
Sir F. Freeling has furnished apartments, coals, candles, &c. in addition to these emoluments. He is a meritorious public servant; but it must be conceded, he and his family are well paid for their services.	
Freeling, G. H. assistant-secretary, post-office	800
Freeling, J. C. secretary to the excise	1500
Freeth, lieut.-col. J. assistant-quarter-master-general	260
Allowance	105
Captain royal staff corps	266

* Sup. to Ency. Britt. art. Fox, written by Mr. Allan.

Freemantle, sir W. H. treasurer of his majesty's household..	£904
Late solicitor for Irish affairs	924
Freemantle, Georgiana, Albinia, and Frances, pensions on c. l. each, 1813	43
Freeman, lieut.-gen. Q. J. lieut.-gen. in the army	593
Late barrack-master and commiss. board of works, Ireland	972
Frewin, Rebecca, pension on c. l. 1824	100
Fyers, lieut.-gen. W. colonel commandant royal engineers, commanding in Ireland	2184
Fuller, major-gen. sir J. colonel 96th foot	1119
President of the consolidated board of general officers..	197
Fullarton, J. moiety of the earl of Bath's hereditary pension out of the excise	1200
Fullarton, John, lord of session, Scotland	2000
Fyddell, S. R. receiver-general of taxes, Lincoln	500
Fry, J. C. registrar in chancery	4224
Gambier, E. J. deputy and 1st clerk, tellers' office	1000
Gambier, sir J. late consul-general in the Netherlands.....	1200
Garrall, capt. H. governor of Haslar-hospital, Plymouth	800
Garrow, sir W. one of the barons of the exchequer	5510
Gascoyne, gen. I. colonel 54th foot, pay	613
Gardiner, col. deputy-adjutant-general, Ireland, <i>March</i> 1823	693
Contingent allowance.....	150
Lieut.-colonel half-pay, <i>Jan.</i> 1825	200
Gardiner, sir R. lieut.-col. royal artillery, 1828	293
Pension for good services, 1813	91
Garvock, capt. J. deputy-assistant adjutant-general, <i>Dec.</i> 1809	260
Allowance in lieu of half-pay as captain of infantry.	127
Secretary to commiss. of royal military coll. <i>June</i> 1814	200
Gawler, H. secretary to master of the rolls	1487
One of the six clerks in chancery	1200
Gibbs, major John, landing surveyor, Hull	700
Gibbs, G. T. W. collector of customs, Yarmouth	700
Gibbard, J. receiver-general of taxes, Bedford.....	400
Gibbons, Edw. assistant-clerk in the treasury	672
Gifford, Robert Francis, baron, pension on English c. l. 1827	800
Ditto on Irish c. l. <i>Aug.</i> 1827	204
Ditto on the Scotch c. l. 1827	198
The father was attorney-general at the trial of Queen Caroline. The pensions, we believe, are for the benefit of the present lord, and the other children of the late sir Robert Gifford.	
Gillies, Adam, lord of session and justiciary, Scotland.....	2600
Commissioner jury court, ditto	600
Gillies, Dr. John, pension on c. l. <i>July</i> 1813.....	200
Gillon, Catharine and Elizabeth, pensions on c. l. 1805, each	97
Gimingham, 2d under-clerk, tellers' office.....	600
Glennie, Ven. J. M. S. archdeacon, Ceylon.....	2000
Gloster, H. protector of slaves, Trinidad	1300

Gloucester, duch. of, pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, <i>Nov.</i> 1820	£1000
This is in addition to the parliamentary allowance. For the incomes of the royal family see p. 167.	
Goddard, Isabella, pension on c. l. 1812	662
Goddard, Louisa, ditto ditto 1825	40
Goderich, viscount, secretary of colonial department	6000
Gostling, N. deputy-register of the prerogative court of Canterbury; from fees	1317
Gordon, gen. Geo. duke of, col. of 1st regt. of foot, pay and emoluments	2325
Governor of Edinburgh castle	1046
Gordon, sir R. ambassador at Constantinople, from 5th <i>April</i>	6000
Gordon, sir George, pension on c. l. <i>June</i> 1821	150
Gordon, J. collector of customs, Bristol	1000
Gordon, capt. sir Jas. A. governor of Plymouth hospital	800
Gordon, lieut.-gen. sir J. W. M.P. for Launceston; col. 23d foot	1034
Quarter-master-general	1883
Gordon, A. chief-clerk, secretary colonial-office	1500
Agent for Demerara	400
Agent for Lower Canada	200
Going, Frances-Anne, pension on c. l. 1830	47
Gore, F. 1st clerk in tellers' office	1000
Goodenough, G. T. late commissioner of taxes, <i>March</i> 1801	150
Late secretary to commissioners for reduction of the national debt, <i>March</i> 1818	500
Gosset, Elizabeth and Gertrude, pensions on c. l. 1828	198
Gosset, Ralph-Allen, pension on civil list, 1829	95
Gomez, A. assessor to the governor, Trinidad	1500
Godby, A. secretary post-office, Edinburgh	600
Goulbourn, rt. hon. H. pension as late Irish secretary, <i>July</i> 1825	2000
<p>The late chancellor of the exchequer seems better qualified for the management of ecclesiastical than secular affairs, of which the tithe-composition-act is an example. Such a specimen of inbecility, folly, and mystification as his speech on the introduction of the civil list this session was never before presented to parliament. To expatiate on the <i>frugality</i> of the late king in not having exceeded his income! Why, had he been HELIOGABALUS himself, and supped on diamonds, he could not have dissipated his immense revenue. Then to talk about the inexpediency of separating the various items of the civil list expenditure, lest the Radicals should discover the personal expenses of the monarch, and thence institute invidious comparisons between royal and republican institutions—what inanity! All these matters are now thoroughly understood by every body. Only read our chapter on the civil list and the <i>economy</i> of George IV. and the cost of a KING will be as clear as day-light. But ought it to be inferred from thence we are unfavourable to monarchical government? No! we know too well what is, to think for a moment of what <i>de novo</i> might be; we know, too, that though the key-stone is not the arch, there could be no arch without it—at least not a <i>Gothic</i> arch!</p>	
Golding, E. receiver-general of taxes, Berks	500

Goodman, J. A. vendue master, Demerara £2986

What enormous emoluments to governors, registrars, secretaries, and other officers in the colonies. Well may the British dependencies be unable to yield any revenue to the mother country; or, even, to defray the expense of their own establishments.

Grady, H. G. allowance as late counsel to excise, Dublin.... 1333

An Irish job. The office abolished, there should have been no allowance.

Graham, sir J. M.P. for Cumberland, 1st lord of the admiralty 5000

One is somewhat at a loss to discover the claims this gentleman had by experience, profession, or otherwise to be placed at the head of the naval department of the country. Nor can we accurately define the *status* of sir James as a politician. His opinions on Parliamentary Reform have not, to our recollection, been explicitly announced; on one occasion he launched out into an extravagant eulogy of the House of Commons, designating it "the noblest assembly of freemen in the world." This might be a mere explosion of oratory and not meant for sober truth. That the baronet possesses abilities of the first order is evident from his forcible and eloquent exposition of the emoluments of privy-councillors, the salaries of public officers, and the costs of foreign missions, which have greatly contributed to fix public attention on the lavish government expenditure.

We trust so able a man has discovered his errors on the currency question, and he no longer entertains the vulgar notion of that class who wrongly ascribe national distress to the withdrawal of the *rag-money*, and the substitution of a metallic circulation. In other respects the sentiments of the first lord of the Admiralty are liberal and enlightened, as is apparent from the following extract from a pamphlet published by him some years ago:—

"The paramount duty of every government is attention to the interests of the community, of which the labourers must form the great majority; the right of property itself is instituted for the good not of the few who possess wealth and honour, but of the many who have them not; if the majority be deeply injured, the public peace is in danger; if the majority want food, private property becomes a nuisance."—*Corn and Currency*, p. 75. Sir James may have trimmed his ideas since these sentiments were published, but we trust the substance remains engraven where it ought to be, in all those entrusted with power over the happiness of the community.

Graham, sir R. late baron of the exchequer..... 3500

Graham, M. Kay, Isabella, and Caroline, c. l. June 1816.. 300

Grafton, duke of, hereditary pension out of the excise revenue 7200

Ditto, ditto post-office ditto 4700

Sealer of king's bench and common pleas 2888

This is one of the four illegitimate descendants of Charles II. raised to ducal peerages. It might be right in this profligate king to quarter the produce of his debauchery on the people's industry, but it is with surprise and indignation we find it continued to the present day. How happened it the revolution Whigs of 1688 did not rid the country of this infamy? The present duke returns two or three members to the lower house: he is said to be an "excellent gentleman;" whether the motto—*Et decus et pretium recti*—"the ornament and recompense of virtue," refers to the pensions or descent of his grace it is not easy to determine.

Graves, C. G. cashier of widows' pensions 700

Granville, W. vice-treas. and commissioner of stamps, Ceylon 2000

Granville, lord, ambassador at Paris	11000
See remarks on foreign embassies and the cost of them to the country, p 183.	
Grange, James, senior clerk in the treasury	1000
Pension on $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund.....	250
Grant, major-gen. governor of Trinidad.....	5535
Grant, J. T. clerk of the cheque, Portsmouth	450
Grant, D. M. collector of customs, Kingston, Jamaica	2500
Grant, sir W. late master of the rolls.....	3750
Grant, maj.-gen. sir C. col. 15th light dragoons, pay and emoluments.....	1237
Grant, C. M.P. for Invernessshire; president of India board	5000
Grant, R. M.P. for Norwich; judge advocate-general.....	2500
Grant, Sophia and Charlotte, pension each on civil list, 1784	49
Grant, Catharine, Ann, and Harriet pensions on ditto, 1790	97
Grant, Ann, ditto, 1827.....	100
Gratton, Lucia, Caroline, and Frances pension each on c. l. 1803	32
Gravatt, col. W. inspector, royal military academy, <i>April</i> 1814	264
Lieut.-colonel invalid engineers, <i>March</i> 1811	326
Gregory, W. and lady Ann Gregory, and survivor, c. l.	461
Gregory, Olinthus, professor of mathematics, Woolwich military academy	558
Gregory, William, late under secretary for Ireland	1000
Keeper of Phoenix-park.....	26
Green, gen. sir C. col. 37th foot	1123
Greene, Wm. comptroller of customs, Liverpool.....	600
Gregg, Robert F. clerk in vice-treasurer's office, Dublin,	390
Allowance as clerk in late Irish treasury, <i>March</i> , 1817	55
Grenville, lord, auditor of the exchequer	4000
Grenville, Thos. chief justice in Eyre, south of Trent	2316
Greville, A. F. commissioner of alienation office, <i>April</i> , 1828	150
Late private secretary to duke of Wellington, pension on civil list, 1830	250
Bath king at arms, <i>Aug.</i> 1829	90
Greville, Charles, comptroller of cash in the excise	600
Receiver general of taxes, Nottingham	600
Secretary of the island of Tobago	350
Allowance as naval officer, Trinidad	572
Greville, C. C. F. clerk of the council.....	2000
Secretary and clerk of the enrolments, Jamaica.....	3000
As late naval officer, Demerara	500

The duke of Wellington, at the period of his resignation, in lieu of providing out of his own pocket for *A. F. Greville*, as his private secretary—if he needed any provision—threw him on the court pension list to be provided for by the people.

The next of the name, *Charles Greville*, married a daughter of the duke of Portland, who provided for her amply, as above, in the excise, receivership of taxes, Tobago and Trinidad. The duke also took good care of her son, *C. C. F. Greville*. The pleasures

of the turf may be fairly indulged in, the britska in summer, and the post-chariot in winter, when not at the public expense.

Grey, hon. H. G. gen., brother of earl Grey; col. 13th light dragoons, pay

£1057

Grey, earl, first lord of the treasury

5000

People wonder why lord Grey, in making up his administration, should leave out Mr. Hume and sir H. Parnell. To these gentlemen the country is indebted for the modicum of retrenchment that has been obtained; sir H. Parnell is a veteran economist, and upwards of ten years ago brought forward an important series of resolutions, shewing the saving which might be effected in the public expenditure—and we well remember, he only met with cold and sneering support from the regular opposition. It cannot have been the *morgue aristocratique* which has excluded them, since there is Poulett Thomson and the Grants with just as little pretension to Corinthianism as the M.P. for Middlesex. With this exception, the premier's selection, in our opinion, has been judicious; all his *aids* are men of good repute, and some of first-rate acquirement; as individuals they stand high, but as a party they are below zero. In fact, the Whigs in their *corporate* capacity were totally without character; no one had the least faith in them; no one wished to see them *tried*; and it is nothing but the stark-staring folly of their predecessors which has given them a chance. If they succeed in regaining public confidence, and in wiping out the stains of 1806, they will effect a great triumph. It would be sheer nonsense to infer what they are now from what they were twenty years ago; since, within the last six months, all mens' minds have undergone a complete revolution, and stand, as lord Castlereagh would say, in "contrast to themselves." All their future credit will rest on their decision on the one great question of PARLIAMENTARY REFORM; if they come forward with a plan commensurate with the wishes and wants of the community, whatever has been alleged of their aristocracy, hollowness, and selfishness will vanish in thin air, and they will acquire such support as will enable them to triumph over every opposition, whether from the Tories or Hierarchy.

Lord Grey is reported to have said, on the first day of the session, that he was not prepared with a plan of parliamentary reform. One would have thought the famous petition of the Friends of the People, in 1793, would have readily afforded some hints on the subject. If his lordship waits to discover some such plan as will satisfy the people, without imposing a sacrifice on his "order," he will, we suspect, wait a long time first; he might as well seek to find out the Phoenix, or some other fabled creation. His lordship is too sagacious not to know where the pith of the business lies, and the sooner he sets to work upon Gatton and Old Sarum the better.

The noble premier is mostly represented as too *exclusive* in his notions to conciliate popular esteem. We should be loth to hang a man for a word or a phrase, any more than a single action of life, unless it were a deliberate and very flagrant atrocity. Besides, although lord Grey did say he would "stick to his order," it ought to be remembered, as a set-off, that in a session or two preceding, he actually took a brother peer to task, for having in his harangue too freely applied the disparaging epithet of *lower order* to the working classes. In fine, we are for suspending judgment, and giving the ministry a trial; if they fail us, we know the alternative—the restoration of the Polignac ministry for a few months, and then a glorious democratic rising to cleanse the whole atmosphere!

Griesbach, Caroline, Elizabeth, and Frances, pension each, on c. l. 1826	£ 50
Griffith, E. police justice, Mary-le-bone	800
Griffith, Walter, Anne, Mary, Henry, George, Charlotte, William, Charles, Arthur, and Harriet, pension, each, on civil list, 1821	18
Grove, E. receiver of taxes, Stafford	600
Grove, H. L. collector of customs, Exeter	590
Groom, R. assistant secretary, tax-office	700
Grosvenor, gen. T. col. 65th foot	1241
Grosvenor, hon. Robert, third son of earl Grosvenor, and M.P. for Chester; comptroller of the king's household	920
Guydicker, Frances, pension on c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1793	240
Gwilt, Robert, clerk, Chelsea-hospital	500
Agent for Newfoundland	100
Gwynne, Thomas, comptroller of legacy duties	100
Gwynne, Georgiana, pension on civil list, 1800	115
Gwyn, Mary, pension on ditto, 1821	400
Hatton, Edw. F. late paymaster of widows' pensions, <i>Jan.</i> 1799	600
Retired pension as commiss. of stamps, <i>Jan.</i> 1819	600
Inspector-general of tea and coffee, <i>Jan.</i> 1819	292
Haldane, Maria, pension on civil list, 1819	200
Hamilton, lieut.-col., inspecting field-officer, Ireland	466
Pension for loss of a leg, <i>Dec.</i> 1811	200
Hamilton, Mrs. pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, <i>July</i> , 1820	250
Hamilton, Arabella, Elizabeth, Mary, Isabella, and survivors of them, c. l. <i>March</i> 1796	461
Hamilton, Arabella, pension on civil list, 1785	177
Hamilton, John, in trust for children of	461
Hamilton, R. prothonotary king's bench, Ireland	1384
Hamilton, W. R. pension on consolidated fund	1000
Hamilton, R. principal clerk of session, Scotland	1000
Professor of public law	280
Hamilton, H. C. J. secretary of embassy at Paris	1100
Hamilton, sir Charles, pension on civil list, 1790	155
Handfield, Catharine, Anne, Eliza, Jane, Mary, Julia, and Sarah, pensions, each, on Irish c. l. 1816	88
Har gen. G. V. unattached pay as general officer	593
Governor of Londonderry and Culmore	499
Hart, right hon. sir A. late lord chancellor of Ireland	3850
Harrison, T. commissioner of excise	1400
Harrison, W. parliamentary counsel to the treasury	1000
Law clerk, war-office	400
Harrison, G. allowance as late assistant secretary, treasury ..	2000
Harrison, J. allowance for loss of office, customs, Dublin	1207
Harrison, Ann, pension on civil list, 1828	400

Haines, H. gentleman of the chamber to the lord chancellor; net emolument from fees in the year ending <i>Jan. 5,</i> 1830	£1755
Hallifax, Gertrude, Charlotte, Marianne, Caroline, Catharine, and Elizabeth, each, out of the civil list, <i>Sept. 1793</i> Daughters, we believe, of a bishop, and connected with the Cock- burns through the Littletons.	60
Harvey, J. S. master in ordinary and accomptant-general in chancery; net emoluments for the year ending <i>Jan.</i> 5, 1830	3184
Hammond, lieut.-gen. sir T. unattached pay as lieut.-gen.	593
Equerry and clerk marshal to the king	1030
Hammond, George, Edmund, Margaret, and William, each out of civil list, <i>Feb. 1806</i>	150
Hall, lieut.-gen., col. 99th foot	1264
Harvey, sir R. J. receiver-general of taxes, Norfolk, <i>Sept. 1821</i> Half-pay of lieut.-col. <i>Oct. 1815</i>	600 200
Besides their regular salaries of £600 or £800 a year, the receiv- ers-general are paid 2s. 6d. per mile, and for expenses when absent from home, on the respective receipts, at the rate of <i>one guinea</i> per day. Sir R. J. Harvey is, we believe, the great tithe-impropriator of Norfolk, who was recently compelled, by the followers of the renowned " <i>Swing</i> ," to some reductions in his levies.	
Harvey, F. clerk of Ulster-road and vice-president of Inland- office	637
Harvey, dame Louisa, pension on civil list, 1826	300
Hardinge, sir H. lieut.-col. 1st regiment of York light infantry Pension for wounds	300
Hartwell, sir F. H. late deputy comptroller of the navy	1164
Hanmer, W. clerk of Nisi Prius for the northern and Nor- folk circuits	580
Clerk of the inner treasury, court of king's bench	602
Hardy, rear-admiral sir Thomas, commissioner of the admiralty	1000
Haultain, Terrick, accomptant, army pay-office	1200
Hassard, col. Jn. commanding royal engineers, Ionian Islands	1195
Hasler, Sarah, pension on civil list, 1780	132
Hastings, Selina, Georgina, Louisa, Edward, and Richard, pension, each, on civil list, 1829	50
Hammond, G. late minister to United States	1200
Hay, Dorothea, Lewis, Elizabeth, Mary, Jane, and Isabella, pensions, each, on civil list, 1806	97
Hay, lady Fanny, pension on c. l. <i>Dec. 1822</i>	100
Mary, ditto c. l. <i>Dec. 1823</i>	200
Ditto additional, c. l. <i>Dec. 1824</i>	100
Hay, D. consul general, Tangiers	2000
Hay, R. W. under secretary of state for the colonies	2000
Hayman, Ann, pension on civil list, 1823	266
Hayne, Henry, commissary judge at Rio Janeiro	1326

Hayter, Elizabeth and Sophia, pension on civil list, 1818.....	£101
Hailes, Daniel, late envoy, &c. to different courts	1127
Hall, Thomas, police justice, Bow-street	800
Hankey, sir F. chief secretary, Malta	1500
Hasell, E. W. receiver of taxes, Westmorland	600
Hawker, Dorothea, Julia, and Mary, pension on civil list, 1827	300
Henn, W. master in chancery, Ireland	3323
Heatly, Mary, pension on civil list, 1790	177
Headfort, marchioness of, pension on c. l. 1821	88
Heathcote, Antoinette, pension on civil list, 1802	233
Heneage, G. H. W. hereditary chief proclamator in the com- mon pleas	100
Hebden, John, superintendent of dead letter office, Ireland ..	230
Taxing clerk in the inland office, Ireland	173
Henley, lord, brother-in-law of sir R. Peel, master in chancery	4644
Some aristocratical stuff lately appeared in the <i>Morning Chronicle</i> , —not from the editor, we are sure, he is incapable of such nonsense —representing the degradation of the peerage by lord Henley, after succeeding to the family title, continuing to hold his appointment of master in chancery, part of whose duty it is to act as messenger from the lords to the commons. We presume this scribe considers it only compatible with the dignity of lords to live by plunder, as in the days of Burke's chivalry, not by the pursuit of some useful voca- tion. But we wonder what can degrade the aristocracy lower : look at their scrambling, intriguing, and apostatizing for office ; look at them condescending to fill the places of <i>port-searchers, sealers,</i> <i>clerks,</i> and <i>wharfingers</i> , for sake of the emoluments ; look at the still greater infamy of quartering themselves, their mothers, children, and relatives on the industry of a starving people ; look at these degradations, and say if proud nobility can fall lower.	
Hereford, viscount, pension on c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1806.....	600
Heard, H. G. late six clerk chancery, Ireland	1348
Herbert, Geo. clerk and auditor in the treasury	819
Henderson, James, consul-general at Bogota.....	2000
Hertslet, L. librarian, foreign secretary's office	700
Superintendent of king's messengers	450
Compensation for loss of fees in Ceylon.....	300
Hearn, W. receiver-gen. of taxes, Isle of Wight	300
Hesketh, Robert, consul at Maranham	1105
Herries, right hon. J. C. late commissary in chief, <i>Aug.</i> 1816, pension	1350
Herries, Isabella, pension on c. l. 1814	230
Herries, lieut.-colonel sir W. comptroller of army accounts ..	1500
Pension for loss of leg	300
Herbert, C. first fiscal, Demerara	3078
Hepburne, Catharine, pension on c. l. <i>March</i> 1829	184
Hewitt, W. clerk of the papers, king's bench prison, from fees	1000
Hewett, gen. rt. hon. sir G. col. 61st foot, pay and emoluments	1221
Hewett, hon. J. commissioner of excise.....	1400
Hewgill, Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1801	233

Hervey, L. late minister at Madrid	£1200
Heytesbury, lord, ambassador at St. Petersburg	12000
Heyland, Rowley, clerk of the rules, Ireland	1107
Hill, sir F. B. receiver-general of taxes, Salop	600
Hill, gen. rt. hon. R. lord, colonel 53d foot	1350
General commanding in chief	3458
Governor of Hull	617
Pension granted by parliament in 1814	2000
Hill, capt. J. commissioner, victualling establishment, Deptford ..	800
Hill, rt. hon. W. Noel, envoy extraordinary, &c. at Naples ..	6000
Hill, sir Geo. F. pension as clerk Irish house of commons ..	2091
Hill, lady, pension on civil list, 1830	467

This lady the Duke brought in as well as his private secretary, and the *whipper-in*, Mr. Holmes, at the death of his administration. Lady Hill, one of the Beresfords, is the wife of the preceding, who has always held large sinecures in Ireland, but who from his imprudence has always been greatly embarrassed. Sir George sold his Irish pension, and was lately named governor of the Leeward Islands, a very lucrative post. With the claims of his wife the ex-premier is best acquainted; but there are the strongest reasons, it is said, why the public should not be burthened with this pension, and it is confidently hoped lord Grey, with his stern integrity, will advise the king to cancel the grant.

Hicks, John, clerk in home department	1129
Higham, S. secretary, national debt office	1300
Hislop, lieut.-gen. sir T. col. 48th foot, pay and emoluments ..	1081
Hinchliffe, H. pension on consolidated fund	1000
Holland, lord, chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster	3563

Well! who would have thought of lord Holland ever being a chancellor. Sinecures are good for something if it be only for the convenience of the *gout*. But the Aristocracy come upon us in so many different shapes, it is rather too bad, these nests of abuse, the counties palatine should be kept up as a kind of hospital for the aged and infirm of the "order." The Bathursts and Bexleys have enriched themselves in these retreats, and we are sorry to see them succeeded by the noble baron; for which appointment we can give no reason, unless it be that the "party" have taken advantage of his lordship's known good nature to place him there as a *but* for the Radicals.

By the by we shall be curious to know the course the Whigs will adopt in their arrangement of the civil list in respect of the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall. It will be remembered lord Brougham made it a serious charge against the Wellington cabinet that they had omitted these appendages of the crown in the surrender by the king of the hereditary revenues. Will the Whigs, now that they are in power, enforce those plans of economy which they made matter of reproach to their opponents for not adopting; or will they resort to some subterfuge as a pretext for preserving the duchy sinecures as a source of patronage to themselves?

From some expressions of the chancellor of the exchequer it is probable the latter alternative will be tried. Lord Althorp said (house of commons, Dec. 13th), "that the revenues of the duchy of Lancaster had never formed part of the revenues of the country;"—"that the duchy had always been considered as a distinct property

of the king, as duke of Lancaster, and had never hitherto been interfered with by parliament." Here are almost as many errors as words. The duchy of Lancaster was united to the crown by act of parliament, during the reign of Edward IV. He had none of the family partibilities of Henry IV. and Henry V. When Henry VII. came to the throne, a new act of parliament again dis severed the duchy of Lancaster from the crown. On the subversion of the monarchy, the duchy fell along with the throne, and must have been extinguished if Cromwell, who began to form ideas of aggrandizing his family, had not caused the duchy to be again separated from the commonwealth by an act of parliament of those times.

What partibility, what objects of the politics of the house of Lancaster or of Cromwell has his present majesty? If the crown should so far forget its dignity as to contend that these revenues are *private property*, let the unworthy claim have weight—let compensation be made even out of the already enormous burdens upon public distress; but do not let us surrender so essential a part of reform as the abolishing of this corrupt, useless, and absurd jurisdiction.

Holdsworth, A. H. M.P. for Dartmouth, governor of Dartmouth-castle

no return

Holdsworth, Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1789 £233

Hosier, W. clerk to auditor of land revenue 861

Hone, J. T. chief justice, Union Hall 800

Hone, Mr. clerk to master Cox, whom see 1425

Hope, Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1806 100

Hooper, C. and T. Martin, representatives of, pension on civil list, 1726 177

Hornidge, W. clerk to master Eden in chancery 1650

Hood, lord, pension on 4½ per cent. fund 1875

Can any one tell the public services of lord Hood?

Hood, T. S. consul at Monte Video 1250

Howard, L. computer of wine and plantation duties, customs 1463

Houston, lieut.-gen. sir W. colonel 20th foot, pay 613

Howard, lieut.-gen. lord, col. 70th foot 1343

Howick, viscount, son of earl Grey, and M.P. for Higham

Ferrers; under secretary of state for the colonies .. 2000

The Greys are crowding thick upon us; we have already chronicled half a dozen or more, brothers, brothers-in-law, sons, and sons-in-law of the premier. Somebody must fill official employments, and it is natural for a man to prefer his own, and no one can blame him when the claims of candidates are equally balanced; but it is rather unusual for so many members of a family to be qualified for offices, and some of these offices of great trust and responsibility. Lord Howick is a young man of promise, but hardly experienced enough to grapple with the many perplexing questions involved in colonial affairs. The WHIGS, however, seem bent on repeating those practices which for so long a period turned the public stomach against them, and made the very name stink in the nostrils of the people. During their short turn of nine months, in 1806, their rapacity exceeded all former example, and never before was witnessed such a precipitate clearing of the public offices to make way for friends and dependents. Earl Grey was then first lord of the Admiralty; his brother and four more Greys received very lucrative appointments; one was sent out commander-in-chief to the Cape of

<p>Good Hope, with a salary of £4000 per annum, and another salary of equal amount as lieut.-governor, though, under such circumstances, the salary of a lieut.-governor had 'never' been more than one or two hundred pounds. But this was not so bad as giving two <i>reversions</i> to lord Erskine's favourite clerk, and filling, with their party connexions the situations of collectors of customs, surveyors of the customs, waiters, and searchers, at Buenos Ayres, a place not then in our possession!</p>	
Hough, T. S. clerk to master Trower in chancery	£1209
Hosier, J. and T. Bernard, pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, Dec. 1796	600
Hornby, Phipps, distributor of stamps, Lancashire	562
Half-pay as captain in the navy	182
Horne, sir William, solicitor-general	4000
Hobart, hon. H. and rt. hon. J. Sullivan, pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, July 1820	600
Hobhouse, rt. hon. H. keeper of state papers	811
Pension as late under secretary of state	1000
Holroyd, sir J. late judge of the king's bench	3500
Hollier, H. receiver-gen. of taxes, Glamorgan and Monmouth	500
Holloway, C. W. lieut.-col. royal engineers, Cape of Good Hope	869
Pension for a wound, 1817	200
Hoblyn, Thomas, chief clerk in the treasury	1400
Hope, lieut.-gen. sir J. colonel 72d foot	1158
Hope, lieut.-gen. sir A. col. 47th foot, pay and emoluments ..	900
Lieut.-gov. of Chelsea Hospital	464
Pension for wound	400
Hope, Charles, lord president court of Session, Scotland	4300
Hodges, W. P. receiver-general of taxes, Dorset	500
Holmes, T. collector of customs, Grenada	1500
Holmes, Thomas Knox, pension on civil list, 1830	500
<p>Had the celebrated Mr. W. Holmes been the <i>whipper out</i> in lieu of the whipper-in of many of the honourable members, we should have deemed him a more meritorious public servant, and better entitled to a pension during the life of his son at the close of his official labours.</p>	
Home, sir E. sergeant-surgeon to the king	277
Surgeon to Chelsea Hospital	546
Retired pay	187
Home, Alexander, earl of, pension on c. l. Aug. 1792	276
Hombourg, princess of Hesse, pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, July 1820	1000
Honyman, sir W. of Armadale, late lord of session	1950
Honyman, dame Mary, pension on Scotch civil list, 1814	138
Honyman, Mary, Catharine, Margaret, and Jemima, pension on civil list, 1815, each	37
<p>Daughters of the preceding dame Mary; the lady's husband was a lord of sessions, a baronet, and possessed a considerable estate. The son was a major while a child. How they came chargeable on the pension list, is most extraordinary.</p>	

Hume, J. D. joint assistant secretary, board of trade	£1500
Hume, A. teller of exchequer, Ireland	1000
Hume, David, one of the barons exchequer, Scotland	2000
Hume, John, clerk in the victualling-office	720
Hume, Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1826	200
Humphrey, Louisa, pension on civil list, 1827	150
Hunt, Mary, pension on civil list, 1816	150
Hunter, Dr. John, pension on c. l. <i>July</i> 1826	100
Additional pension on c. l. <i>June</i> 1827	100
Physician, we believe, to marquis Wellesley during his viceroy- ship—and so rewarded for medical skill and attendance!	
Hunter, sir R. pension on Irish c. l. <i>Jan.</i> 1826	184
Additional pension on c. l. <i>Jan.</i> 1827	92
Huskisson, T. paymaster of the navy	1200
Huskisson, G. collector of customs, St. Vincent	1500
Huskisson, J. W. collector of customs and provincial judge, Ceylon	1184
Huntingdon, earl of, pension on civil list, 1829	400
This nobleman is reckoned among the <i>poor peers</i> : his brothers and sisters are on the pension list for £222: 10s. The earldom was in abeyance in 1819, and the title claimed on the speculation of re- ceiving a pension to support it.	
Hughes, G. W. D. receiver of taxes for Kent, 1820	600
Half-pay of captain in the royal navy, <i>June</i> 1815	180
Hutchinson, hon. A. A. H. commissioner of customs	1400
Hutchinson, lord, (earl of Donoughmore) pension, by act of parl.	2000
Ingram, A. R. receiver of taxes, Cumberland	500
Inglis, doctor, bishop of Nova Scotia	2000
Iggulden, I. dep. reg. prerog. court of Canterbury; from fees .	1200
Innes, James, secretary and registrar, Berbice	2000
Irvine, A. one of the lords of session, Scotland	2000
Irving, W. inspector-general of imports and exports	900
Irving, Lucy, pension on $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties	120
Jackson, maj.-gen. sir R. D. colonel 81st foot, pay	613
Deputy quarter-master general	691
Jackson, George, commissary judge at Sierra Leone	2145
Jackson, J. clerk in foreign office	720
Jackson, Laura Harriet, pension on c. l. <i>April</i> 1816	100
Jacob, W. comptroller of corn returns	765
Jadis, Henry, paymaster, exchequer-bills	600
Clerk in India board office	500
Jardine, sir H. king's remembrancer court of excheq. Scotland	1700
Jarnac, madame de, pension on c. l. <i>March</i> 1794	177
Jeans, rev. Thomas, pension on c. l. <i>July</i> 1780	178
Jebb, R. second justice king's bench, Ireland	3730
Jeffrey, Lucia, pension on civil list, <i>April</i> 1816	200
Jeffrey, Francis, lord advocate of Scotland	2500
Well, this is a revolution! Who could have thought of passing	

from the guidance of the prince of Waterloo to the prince of critics! If we live we will have a spy in St. Stephen's at this prime feather of the Edinburgh Review. Jeffrey made a noble speech on the triumph of the THREE DAYS, and, we trust, he will not <i>back out</i> ; —he can write, too, as fine poetry in prose as <i>Lalla Rookh</i> . He is an uncommonly clever fellow.	
Jefferey, T. N. collector of customs, Nova Scotia.....	£2000
Jenkinson, R. H. registrar of excise.....	400
Receiver of stamps.....	800
Lieutenant of Dover-castle.....	168
Jenner, R. collector of excise, Glasgow.....	500
Jennings, Ann, pension on civil list, <i>July</i> 1801	252
Jeremie, J. chief justice, St. Lucia	2000
Registrar of slaves.....	500
Jesse, Edward, deputy-surveyor of royal parks, &c.....	400
Commissioner of hackney-coaches	330
Gentleman of the ewry (king's household).....	285
Joddrell, Augusta, pension on c. l. <i>March</i> 1794	177
Jones, J. Edw. assist. deputy-adj.-gen. royal artillery, 1818 .	273
Lieutenant-colonel royal artillery, 1828.....	273
Forage allowance	73
Jones, W. marshal of the king's bench prison; from fees, <i>about</i>	2804
Jones, W. clerk to master Cross, in chancery	1443
Jones, B. S. assistant secretary, India board.....	1200
Jones, W. cashier of half-pay	900
Jones, J. T. lieut.-col. royal engineers, Woolwich, and for <i>inspecting fortresses in the Netherlands</i>	1170
Pension for wounds	300
Johnson, Robert, late justice common pleas, Ireland.....	1107
Johnson, William, third justice common pleas, Ireland.....	3692
Johnson, J. Irish secretary's office, London	829
Johnson, W. F. chief clerk, ordnance department.....	800
Johnston, L. F. C. judge of criminal inquiry, Trinidad	2217
Johnston, sir W. pension on c. l. <i>March</i> 1794.....	738
Johnston, E. J. pension on c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1827	400
Keane, major-gen. sir J. col. 94th foot	425
Unattached pay, and staff pay in Jamaica	1901
Pension for wounds	350
Kelly, Patrick, vice-consul at Lima; salary	1177
Kekwith, George, puisne judge, Cape of Good Hope	1500
Kempt, sir James, master-general of the ordnance	3176
Colonel of 40th regiment of foot	1020
Kemmis, Henry, assistant barrister, Kildare.....	369
Commissioner of inquiry, Ireland	990
Kenyon, lord, custos brevium, court of king's bench; from fees	2696
Kenyon, hon. Tho. brother of preceding; filazer, exigenter, and clerk of outlawries in the court of king's bench; fees	1254
Compensation, per act 6 Geo. IV.....	5463

Kennedy, Elizabeth, Susanna, Sarah, and Ellen, their lives and survivor, c. l. each	£92
Kensit, H. clerk to master Stratford, in chancery	1075
Keppel, gen. right hon. sir W. col. 2d foot, pay & emoluments	876
Kerr, lady Mary, pension on c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1825	200
Kilmorey, gen. F. earl of, colonel 86th foot	1220
Kingston, J. commissioner, colonial audit-office	800
Kinsale, lord, pension on c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1823	369
Kingsland, viscount, pension on c. l. <i>Oct.</i> 1826	200
Kinnoul, earl of, pension out of 4½ per cent. duties	1000
King, sir A. B. his majesty's stationer, Ireland	335
Compensation as printer to Irish house of commons ...	850
King, Harriet M. widow, pension on c. l. <i>June</i> 1792	431
A set of creatures have lately disgraced the public press, by advertising for wives, with small properties, which the knaves promise shall be at the ladies' disposal <i>during their lives</i> . Speculators of this class will find our <i>Pension List</i> of great convenience; they will be able to select suitable matches from the widows and sempstresses of all ages, rank, and income; and though some, perhaps, a little the worse for the wear and tear of official duty, in attendance on the court and grandees of the land, quite good enough for them.	
Kirkland, J. receiver of crown rents in London and Middlesex	500
Agent for Nova Scotia and Cape Breton	200
Agent for recruiting service	834
Kirkcudbright, baron, pension on c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1828	200
Kirwan, Wilhelmina, pension on c. l. <i>Jan.</i> 1807	266
Knight, G. W. H. inspector-general of customs, Leith, 1817 ..	600
Captain in the navy	191
Knight, Cornelia, pension on c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1814	300
Knighton, sir W. receiver of duchy court of Lancaster and of duchy court of Cornwall	no return.

Keeper of the privy purse to the late king. This retired and wealthy favourite might usefully employ his leisure in his Hampshire retreat, in affording the burthened community information of the nature of the services of those troops of females who crowd the *Court Pension List*; to many of whom the Magdalen, or tread-wheel, would have been more appropriate, than annuities for life out of the taxes. There is an ambassador, long kept out of the way at a northern court; and a certain major-general, loaded with military emoluments and offices, though no soldier, further than wearing an uniform, who would be well qualified to assist in the undertaking. The names, especially the *Georginas*, *Georgianas*, the Bathursts, the Lennoxes, the Herries, and sundry selections from the Continent, are significant enough; but there are others, to whom there is no clue, and the denomination under which they are set forth cannot be depended upon. Sir John Newport mentioned an instance, a few nights since, in the house of commons, (*Dec.* 15th,) illustrative of the way they managed these things at the Castle. A pension of £1000 for many years stood in the Irish civil list, in the name of *George Charles*; no such person was known to exist any where; and on inquiry, it turned out that this was a pension to the count de Verry, who received it under the name of Charles, and was for some services rendered at Paris.

For the last 70 years the pensions charged on the civil list, of the three kingdoms, exclusive of the immense sums paid for similar objects out of the Leeward Island duties, the consolidated fund, and other sources, have amounted to nearly £200,000 per annum. And for what, or on whom has this immense sum been squandered? On ———; but the truth will out one day; the Circean and Paphian rites at the Cottage will be shown up, and form an appropriate supplement to the *Parc aux Cerfs*, and other recorded debaucheries of the Bourbon and German courts.

Leaving these abominations, we would beg to be informed, whether the Whigs intend to institute any inquiry into the Duchy of Cornwall and the stannary courts. There is no prince of Wales, nor at present, we believe, any in prospect; so the time of reform could never be more appropriate. Besides *Dr. Knighton*, with immense emoluments, as receiver-general, there are other officers—among them, an assay-master for tin, who has never even visited that, to him, remote principality—the sinecure of his infancy, manhood, and maturity.

Knollys, gen. W. unattached pay as late major 3d foot guards	£800
Governor of Limerick	306
Pension on civil list, <i>Sept.</i> 1814.....	399
Knox, John, pension on civil list, <i>June</i> 1800	177
Knox, John, pension on civil list, <i>Dec.</i> 1802	535
Knox, Mary Anne, pension on civil list, <i>Nov.</i> 1801	177
Knox, H. V. joint prothonotary, common pleas, Ireland	3575
Kuper, Rev. W. pension on civil list, <i>Oct.</i> 1816	400
This person must be a German—probably an Hanoverian. What claim can he have on the taxes of England?	
Kyd, T. clerk and inspector of taxes, Edinburgh	545
Lance, J. H. commissary judge at Surinam	1500
Lack, John, clerk of the rates, customs.....	1100
Lack, T. assistant secretary board of trade	1500
Laffan, sir Joseph de Courcey, pension on c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1828 ..	192
Lamb, George, brother of lord Melbourne, and M.P. for Dun- garvon; under sec. of state in the home department..	2000
Lambton, H. brother of lord Durham; groom of the bed-cham.	366
Lang, Charles, master-shipwright, Deptford	400
Lang, Oliver, ditto, Woolwich	650
Lake, viscount, pension on consolidated fund	2000
Lieutenant-general	456
Pension obtained by his father for services in India and Ireland; the last, at least, did not merit it. The present viscount is better known as a late lord of the bedchamber than in his military capacity.	
Langrishe, Hannah, pension on Irish c. l. <i>March</i>	460
Langrishe, Anne, pension on Irish c. l. <i>Aug.</i> 1796	177
There was a sir Hercules Langrishe, bart. who received large compensations at the Union, and well known as a good companion. These ladies may probably be his relatives, and the lord lieutenant's generosity moved by the boon companionship of the baronet.	
Lansdowne, marquis of, president of the council	2835

The marquis, who is an estimable and enlightened man, has been hitherto silent on the vital question of parliamentary reform; but at

the commencement of the session he declared himself favourable to an extension of the elective franchise; not merely for the sake of change, but amendment, by more adequately representing the property and intelligence of the community. This was very good; but his lordship said nothing about *Calne*, nor about that other borough, the name of which we forget, in the *other pocket*. Ah, my lord president, we must have all the boroughs and the ballot—and the sooner the better; for, charged as the whole social state is with combustible matter—king, lords, and commons, sitting over gunpowder—there is no knowing what a few months, weeks, or even days may bring forth.

Larpet, F. S. chairman of the board of audit	£1500
Lambert, lieut.-gen. sir J. col. 10th foot	1224
Lane, Thomas, secretary and registrar, Barbadoes.....	1469
Lavington, Frances, baroness, pension c.l. <i>Sept.</i> 1812	400
Lamb, sir F. brother of lord Melbourne, ambassador at Vienna	12000
Lascelles, R. late receiver-general for Monmouth.....	200
Chamberlain of Brecon	245
Laing, A. S. police justice, Hatton-garden	800
Lawrence, T. chief clerk, post-office	586
Layard, C. E. civil and military paymaster-general	2000
Leach, sir John, master of the rolls	7000
Leake, S. R. M. assistant clerk in the Treasury	672
Leake, S. M. retired allowance as compt. of army accounts ..	2000
Leake, R. M. master of report-office in Chancery	4589

Sir E. Sugden might well lift up his eyes in astonishment, when he discovered the enormous emoluments of this gentleman. The report office is a mere copying office; and why the duty should be remunerated at this extravagant rate is wholly unaccountable. The chief clerkship is a sinecure, the work being done at a low rate by hiring quill-drivers. In 1798 the receipts of the office amounted to £1069, having increased upwards of fourfold. These enormous sums are all derived from copies of documents in suits; for which Mr. Spence suggests as a remedy the mutual interchange between the solicitors of the opposite parties the various copies required. The increase in the emoluments of all officers in chancery has been enormous. In 1797 the fees of the secretary in bankruptcy were £1100, of which £500 went to pay clerks, and £600 into the secretary's own pocket. At present the fees are £10,000, of which the chancellor himself receives £4000, though formerly he received no part.—For an account of other chancery officers see *Pugh, Utterson, Raynsford, and Wingfield*. We refer to these gentlemen, not from any personal motive, or from a wish to imply any peculiarity in their mode of discharging judicial duties, but simply because the spirit has happened to move us, in reading their names, to hang a note to them.

Le Blanc, Thomas, master of court of king's bench	2000
One of the registrars for Middlesex	582
Leigh, George, pension on civil list, <i>Sept.</i> 1819	700
This gentleman was in the 10th hussars, and held some office under George IV., and has apartments at St. James's Palace. He married the sister of the poet, Lord Byron.	
Leigh, R. inspector-general, tax-office	600
Leigh, F. allowance as late collector of excise	1384

Lees, sir E. S. clerk of a road post-office, Ireland	£1424
Lees, T. O. clerk of a road post-office, Ireland	816
Searcher, packer, and gauger, Wexford	504
Lees, W. clerk, ordnance department	825
Leeds, duke of, constable of Middleham-castle	46
Lee, W. clerk of ships' entries, customs	1215
Leggatt, Horatio, solicitor of taxes, in lieu of bills	1500
Lennard, J. B. receiver of fees, privy council-office	830
Leopold, prince, of Saxe Coburg	50000
Ah, poor BULL! how much this £50,000 a-year would help thy "ill-fed sides and window'd raggedness."	
Lennox, lady Louisa, pension on c. l. <i>May</i> 1764	445
Lennox, lady Georgiana, pension on c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1819	150
Lechmere, sir A. receiver-general of taxes, Worcester	500
Leeves, E. clerk in privy-council for trade	137
Pension on c. l. having been private secretary to the late Mr. Huskisson, 1828	200
Legge, hon. H. commissioner of customs	1400
Legge, hon. H. deputy comptroller of the navy	1200
Lemon, Robert, deputy-keeper of state papers, <i>Jan.</i> 1818 ..	467
Secretary to commissioners for state papers, <i>July</i> 1825 ..	200
Leitrim, earl of, <i>port-searcher</i> at Dublin	1359
The earl is colonel of the Donegal militia; his son, William, is in the army; and his cousin, J. M. Clements, is M.P. for Leitrim- shire.	
Ley, W. second clerk assistant, house of commons	2500
Ley, J. H. clerk, house of commons	2300
Leybourn, Thomas, professor of mathematics, Military College ..	390
Lightfoot, J. accountant and comptroller of stamps	800
Limerick, earl of, clerk of the crown and hanaper, Ireland ..	405
Liston, sir R. late ambassador to the Ottoman Porte	2300
Littledale, sir J. judge of the court of king's bench	5500
Littledale, J. collector of customs, Whitehaven	500
Little, W. receiver-general of taxes, Warwick	600
Lipscombe, right rev. W. bishop of Jamaica	4000
Lock, Georgiana and Lucy F. out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund, each ..	200
Lloyd, John, commiss. for relief of insolvent debtors, Ireland ..	2062
Lloyd, Mary-Anne and Emma, pensions on c. l. <i>April</i> 1815 ..	266
Lloyd, Mary-Harriet, pension on c. l. <i>Aug.</i> 1829	200
Longmore, A. clerk, remembrancer's office, Edinburgh	450
Marshal of exchequer and clerk for land-tax	130
Longley, E. J. clerk in tally-writer's office	700
Compensation for loss as <i>tally-cutter</i> , <i>Oct.</i> 1826	187
Lord, E. C. receiver-general of taxes, Wales	500
Loftus, general, col. 2d dragoon guards	1579
Lieutenant of the Tower	745
Lowe, major-gen. sir H. 2d in command, Ceylon	4000
Colonel of 93d foot	

Low, Peter, commissioner of inquiry, Ireland	£1200
Loughborough, lord, clerk of chancery, Scotland	1135
Militia pay as lieutenant-colonel	419
Lowdham, L. A. secretary of lunatics to lord chancellor	1301
Lowry, John, 2d professor of mathematics, military college ..	297
Lulham, Edw. clerk in the tax-office	629
Lumley, lieut.-gen. hon. sir W. col. 6th dragoons, pay	911
Pension for wounds	400
Groom of bed-chamber	360
Lushington, sir H. consul general at Naples	1350
Lushington, E. H. late commiss. colonial audit-office, <i>July</i> 1824	600
King's coroner in the court of king's bench	1160
Lushington, S. G. commissioner of customs	1400
Lushington, rt. hon. S. R. pension, <i>March</i> 1825	1500
What claims can this gentleman have to a pension? Always filling lucrative offices, and now governor of Madras, for which post he deserted his twenty pound Canterbury constituents.	
Lushington, dame Fanny, pension c. l. <i>Nov.</i> 1813	350
Ludlow, gen. Geo. J. Earl, col. 38th foot, pay	613
Governor of Berwick	169
Pension for loss of an arm	400
Lutwidge, C. collector of customs, Hull	1000
Luttrell, H. F. commissioner of audit	1200
Luttrell, J. Fownes, M.P. for Minehead; clerk of the pipe in Ireland	450
Lukin, R. 1st clerk, war-office	1400
Lyndoch, gen. T. lord, col. 14th foot, pay	613
Governor of Dumbarton Castle	164
Pension by act of parliament	2000.
Lyndhurst; lord, late lord high chancellor, pension	4000
The Whigs appear to have been very much at a loss how to dis- pose of the ex-chancellor, there being evidently risk in leaving at large and totally unoccupied so clever and fertile a genius. It was at first determined to fix him in the court of exchequer, than which nothing could be more appropriate, with a thumping salary and little to do: but here they reckoned without their host, the chief baron not choosing to write himself down after the Dogbery fashion. Lord Lyndhurst has himself to blame for the dilemma. Had his lordship applied more assiduously to his studies—mastered the reports of the law commissioners, and graduated in judicial equity, he need not have sunk prematurely into the dead weight mass. But the fascinations of Brighton and the pavilion were irresistible; and the intensity with which the noble lord paid his devoirs there, through hail, rain, and fog, calls to mind the old stories of Hero and Leander. But something must be done; why not make him an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipo. to the Ottoman Porte, or send him over to India as governor-general?	
Lyon, major-gen. sir J. col. 24th foot	1514
Staff pay as lieut.-gen. Leeward Islands	1383
Governor of Barbadoes	3767
Pension by Queen Charlotte	100

Lyndon, Helena, pension on Irish civil list, <i>Oct.</i> 1766.....	£172
This lady must have been in the cradle or earlier state of existence when the pension was granted. As sometimes a life in Ireland has been carried on to the next generation, an inquiry should now be made who really enjoys this pension.	
Maberly, lieut.-col. W. L. son of the M. P. for Abingdon ; surveyor-general of the ordnance	1200
Machen, E. deputy surveyor of Dean Forest, <i>Jan.</i> 1816	350
Joint deputy gaveller of Dean Forest, <i>March</i> 1815 ..	100
Magenis, Richard, commissioner of civil accounts, Dublin, <i>Jan.</i> 1813	738
Captain half-pay list 7th fuzileers, <i>Feb.</i> 1811	220
Pension for loss of an arm, <i>May</i> 1811	100
Magra, Emily and Harriet, pension on civil list, 1805, each..	194
Mackenzie, Henry, clerk remembrancer's office, Edinburgh, <i>Nov.</i> 1765 (exclusive of fees).....	350
Comptroller of taxes, <i>Aug.</i> 1799	721
Macleod, George, inspector-general of stamps	600
M'Nair, R. collector of customs, Leith	800
Maclean, A. receiver-general of Scotland	2000
Maclean, lieut.-gen. sir F. col. 84th foot, pay and emoluments	1286
M'Clintock, J. and W. F. union compensation as chief sergeant at arms, Ireland	2545
M'Clelland, Thomas, receiver-general of post office, Ireland..	553
M'Clelland, James, baron of the exchequer, Ireland	3692
M'Gregor, sir J. director general army medical board, and physician to garrison at Portsmouth	2172
M'Gregor, M. consul at Panama	1377
Maconochie, A. lord of session and justiciary, Scotland.....	2600
M'Kenzie, J. H. lord of session and justiciary, Scotland	2600
Commissioner of the jury court, Scotland	600
Macdonald, sir James, M. P. for Calne ; clerk of the privy seal	450
Macdonald, major-gen. J. colonel 67th foot, pay	613
Deputy adj.-gen. to forces	691
Macleay, W. S. commissioner of arbitration at the Havanna..	1850
Macintosh, sir James, commissioner for the affairs of India ..	1500
Pension from the East India Company as late recorder at Bombay	1200

The late recorder of Bombay, we suspect, never expected to live to times like these ; to see Brougham lord-chancellor and Jeffrey lord-advocate, and himself seated at the India board, with a salary of £1500 a year, having nothing more to do, according to the representation of Mr. Tierney, than to look over the newspapers, and when tired of that look out of the window. There is, however, no good without admixture of evil, and, we fear, the last will be our lot by the change in the ministry ; for we have bought the first volume of sir James's instructive History of England, and it is very probable we shall be left in the lurch with it, and never have the completion. But we shall be content to consider our loss as a set-off against the good deeds of the honourable commissioner ; few

public men can boast of having run so long and devious a course, with so few <i>breaks</i> , as sir James Mackintosh. During our <i>evil</i> days, when England was under the sway of that pestiferous triumvirate Sidmouth, Canning, and Castlereagh, sir James delivered speeches which did honour to his principles, his consistency, and independence.	
Macleod, lieutenant-gen. sir John, colonel commandant horse artillery, director general of artillery, and master gunner, St. James's Park	£2782
Mann, gen. Gother, colonel royal engineers and inspector-gen. of fortifications	2964
M'Leay, A. secretary and registrar, New South Wales	2000
Allowance in lieu of pension, per annum	700
M'Mahon, sir W. master of the rolls, Ireland	3969
Macfarlane, lieutenant-gen. sir R. colonel of 89th foot, pay, exclusive of clothing emoluments	613
M'Murdo, D. collector of customs, Glasgow	500
Macauley, J. S. captain royal engineers, Oct. 1829	202
Professor of fortification, military academy	250
Macauley, T. B., M.P. for Calne; commissioner of bankrupts	320

Mr. Macauley may profit more or less than this sum; we have put it down from the return of his fellow reaper the hon J. H. Abbott. The gains, we believe, depend on assiduity, and on something else which shall be nameless. The commissioners are described by Mr. Cooper, in his work on the Court of Chancery, as very old or very young men, lawyers, barristers, and solicitors, the personal friends of the lord chancellor who seek the spoil of insolvent estates, for the purpose of pocket-money, a succedaneum for briefs, or to eke out scanty emoluments derived from other sources. Some of them are police-justices, others commissioners of inquiry, city pleader, clerks of the petty bag, and examiners. Altogether they bear such a disreputable name, that lord Brougham will surely attempt some reform in their practices and institution.

By the by, is Macauley the author of the two pamphlets which Croker, under a strange delusion, thrashed so unmercifully, thinking they were the productions of the late M.P. for Yorkshire. If they be the hon. member's we can assure him they do him no credit, and are not half so good, even as his *reviews* of the *Utilitarians*. Such clubhouse and party stuff, such personal abuse and parasitical slandering we never before read nor witnessed. They do not contain a single general truth, or political principle, and as to the PEOPLE they are never once alluded to, as if such an element of the social state was a non-entity. We are told indeed the late ministry could not stand, because it had not the support either of the church or of the "great families." What imbecility! just as if the church were any thing more at this day than a rotten stick, and as to any *strength* to be derived from the hereditary families, a man might as well seek strength from a hereditary cancer in the stomach. Then what impertinence in a commissioner of bankrupts likening the duke of Wellington to "an old matchlock or battering ram." In fine, we never met with any productions of the press which excited such an universal feeling of contempt and abhorrence; and it is fortunate for the author that they are now forgotten with the last year's almanack, otherwise they might have formed an insuperable obstacle to his success in life or even to his admission into decent society.

Maister, H. W. registrar of deeds for east riding of Yorkshire	£650
Maitland, major-gen. sir P. col. 1st West India regiment . . .	
Unattached pay as late captain of grenadier guards ..	500
Staff pay and emoluments as lieut.-governor of Nova Scotia and governor of Anapolis	6093
Maitland, gen. F. colonel Ceylon rifle regiment	921
Lieut.-governor of Dominica	366
Mallet, J. L. secretary in the audit-office	1000
Maling, major T. assistant military sec. to commander-in-chief, and captain 2d West India regiment	1043
Marsden, Alexander, pension on civil list, during lives of his daughters	645
Marsden, W. retired allowance as secretary to the Admiralty ..	1500
Marsden, rev. G. senior chaplain New South Wales, with house	578
Marsden, Elizabeth and Maria, pensions on c. l. <i>Dec.</i> 1806 ..	300
Marshall, Edward, clerk in war-office	800
Clerk of estimates in war-office	150
Marshall, H. A. auditor and accountant-general, Ceylon	2000
Manners, lord T. late lord chancellor of Ireland	3692
Manning, W. T. third clerk to clerk of ships entries	1811
Manning, John, surveyor-general customs	800
Martin, vice-adm. sir T. B. comptroller of the navy	2000
Martin, D. cashier of foreign half-pay, and retired full pay ..	700
Mangin, A. clerk secretary's office, Ireland	1074
Mansfield, rev. W. clerk of king's silver, common pleas	550
Manningham, C. W. deputy and first clerk, teller's office	1000
Mascall, E. J. retired allowance as collector of customs	1750
Mash, T. B. comptroller of accounts lord chamberlain's dep. ..	1445
Malcolm, vice-adm. sir P. commander-in-chief, Mediterranean	2555
Maxwell, C. W. governor of St. Christopher	3490
Maturin, Harriet, widow, pension on Irish civil list, 1826 . . .	46
Matthews, J. R. consul-general at Lisbon	1370
Mansfield, countess of, pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties, <i>March</i> 1814	1000
Manchester, duchess dowager of, compensation allowance for loss of the office of collector of customs outwards, held by the late duke of Manchester	2928
Here is a curious case—a dowager duchess, ninety years of age at least—receiving compensation for loss of office as searcher of customs! What services can this lady have rendered? Her husband was known some fifty years ago as a court lord, and if the marriage was improvident, why must the widow be quartered on the public? Has not a labourer's or a mechanic's wife an equal claim? Must we have a pauper nobility to support the dignity of the crown? Why is she not maintained by her son, the late governor of Jamaica; or her grandson, lord Mandeville, who married a rich heiress?	
Marlborough, duke of, hereditary pension out of post-office ..	5000
Father of that mysterious reformer, the marquess of Blandford, and of many others in the navy, army, and church. The pension is	

a proof of the inutility of hereditary honours in guaranteeing hereditary <i>nobility</i> : John, the first duke, might deserve the pension, but can it be said his descendant does?	
Master, Isabella F. pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. fund.....	£200
Mayo, earl of, pension as chairman of the committees of the late house of lords, Ireland.....	1332
This pension was given by an act of parliament; it was an abuse, and ought to be revoked by another.	
May, sir G. collector of customs, Belfast	1000
Maynard, George, computer of duties on East India calicoes	1449
Mayer, G. C. librarian in colonial-office.....	721
Mayne, Richard, commissioner of metropolitan police	800
Maule, George, solicitor to treasury, salary	2000
Emoluments	850
Mayow, P. W. assistant solicitor of excise	2000
Meade, hon. J. consul-general at Madrid	1613
Meade, lieut.-gen. Robert, colonel 12th foot.	1266
Pension for wounds	400
Melbourne, viscount secretary of state, home affairs	6000
Merry, A. late envoy, &c. to the United States.....	1700
Mellish, Amelia, Eleanora, Elizabeth, and Wilhelmina, pension on civil list, 1825, each	50
Meetkerke, A. receiver-general of taxes, Hertford	500
Melluish, H. E. captain royal engineers, 1814.....	220
Extra pay, employed in Canada.....	202
Pension for a wound, 1814.....	100
Melville, viscount, lord keeper of privy seal, Scotland	2675
Mitford, C. receiver-general of taxes, Sussex.....	600
Mitford, R. chairman, board of taxes.....	1600
Agent for herring fishery	230
Mitford, B. commissioner of inquiry, Ireland.....	1200
Mitford, John, commissioner of bankrupts, clerk of inrolments in chancery, deputy register for Middlesex, commissioner for appeals from board of excise, and auditor of Duchy of Lancaster.....	no return
Mitchell, E. clerk vice treasurer's office, Ireland	720
Computer of off-reckonings	184
Allowance as late clerk in Irish treasury	507
Miller, J. referee and partidon, Trinidad	1902
Milne, A. secretary to commissioners of woods and forests....	1650
Miller, sir W. lord of session, Scotland	2000
Millar, major-gen. W. unattached general officer, 1825.....	479
Inspector of artillery, 1827.....	350
Inspector of royal brass foundry.....	100
Allowance for one servant	27
Mills, F. R. precis writer in home department, <i>April</i> 1820..	300
Librarian in home department, <i>April</i> 1820	675
Mingin, W. first puisne judge, Cape of Good Hope	1500

Minto, earl of, pension on civil list, <i>April</i> 1800	£938
Milnes, sir R. S. and during lives of dame Milnes and daughters, pension on English civil list, <i>Jan.</i> 1809.....	557
Pension on Irish civil list, 1809	445
Lady Milnes is, we believe, a near relative of the house of Bentinck; the gentleman was formerly in the Blues. On his marriage was appointed a deputy governor of Canada, or of some colony, as a provision. A pension on retiring is, of course, a natural consequence of previous employment.	
Minshull, G. R. superannuated allowance as receiver-general of taxes for Buckinghamshire, <i>Aug.</i> 1825.....	300
Police magistrate, <i>Jan.</i> 1818	800
Milnes, R. R. receiver-general of taxes, York	600
Moncrieff, sir J. W. lord of session and justiciary, Scotland ..	2600
Moneypenny, David, lord of session and justiciary, Scotland ..	2600
Commissioner of the jury court, Scotland	600
Montagu, H. S. commissioner of stamps	1012
Montagu, G. W. A. deputy chairman, board of stamps.....	1412
Money, W. T. consul-general at Venice.....	1043
Mornington, Ann, countess dowager of, pension on civil list, <i>July</i> 1813	600
By the Powers! here is the prince of Waterloo's aged mother, Anne Hill, among the state paupers. This is too bad at any rate. We always knew the Duke was fond of money, but we did think he would provide for his parent. It is not less a reproach to his brothers Wellesley, Maryborough, Cowley, and Gerard-Valerian, the prebendary of Durham, all of whom have been receiving not less than £40,000 a year, and yet to suffer their venerable progenitor to be maintained out of the taxes, is infamy past endurance. What a gripping set they must be! Arthur was always thrifty and provident, and there are persons in London in possession of a pressing letter he addressed at the commencement of his career, soliciting a very humble office under the Irish government as a permanent provision.	
Morier, D. R. consul-general at Paris	1874
Morier, J. late minister to Mexico	1100
Morier, J. P. late minister to Saxony	1700
Morris, Thomas, surveyor-general of customs.....	800
Morrison, J. W. deputy master and worker, mint-office	800
Morrison, gen. E. colonel 13th foot, pay	613
Governor of Chester	169
Mortlock, sir J. commissioner of excise.....	1400
Morisset, J. T. superintendent of police, New South Wales ..	600
Governor of Norfolk, and half-pay as lieut.-col. in army	—
Molleson, Eleanor, pension on civil list, <i>July</i> 1793	233
Montford, lord, pension on civil list, <i>March</i> 1803.....	611
Montgomery, sir George, pension on civil list, <i>Dec.</i> 1813....	369
Montgomery, R. lord treasurer remembrancer, Scotland	400
Montgomery, sir Joseph, presenter of signatures, Scotland ..	610
Montgomery, lady, S. pension on civil list, <i>April</i> 1826	152
And her daughter, miss Marian, c. l. <i>Feb.</i> 1827	97

Molesworth, viscount, pension on civil list, <i>July</i> 1820	£354
Mountmorres, F. H. viscount, pension on civil list, <i>April</i> 1826	277
Moore, R. deputy inspector of hospitals, Ireland	641
Surgeon to house of industry	75
Moore, Arthur, second justice common pleas, Ireland	3692
Moore, James, pension on civil list, <i>March</i> 1809	780
Mooyaart, J. N. collector of customs, Ceylon	1041
Mountain, Eliza, M. W. pension on civil list, 1826	300
Muddle, R. H. harbour master and superintendent of pilots, Demerara	1019
Munday, George, clerk to master Farrar, in chancery	1479
Murray, major-gen. hon. G. unattached pay as major-general Auditor of exchequer, Scotland	492 1200
Murray, sir P. baron of the exchequer, Scotland	2000
Murray, lady Charlotte, pension on civil list, <i>Dec.</i> 1803	300
Murray, C. K. police justice, Union Hall	800
Cursitor for Essex and Berks	90
Murray, hon. Deborah, pension on civil list, 1821	200
Murray, E. registrar of slaves, Trinidad	2653
Murray, lieut.-gen. right hon. sir G. M.P. for Perthshire; colonel 42d foot, pay and emoluments	1168 141
Governor of Fort George	2000
Murray, J. W. lord of session, Scotland	600
Commissioner of the jury court	184
Murray, lady Virginia, pension on civil list, 1784	300
Muir, William, pension on civil list, <i>Nov.</i> 1777	333
Musgrave, T. M. retired allowance as clerk in alien-office, 1816 Comptroller of twopenny post-office, 1824	500 233
Muskerry, baroness, pension on civil list, 1825	800
Mulgrave, countess of, pension on civil list, <i>Aug.</i> 1829	
Lord Mulgrave is a general officer in the army, colonel of 31st foot, a knight of the grand cross of the bath, governor of Scarborough, lord lieutenant, custos rotulorum, and vice-admiral of the west-riding of York. As his lordship has not returned the emoluments of these offices we are unable to state them, but we believe they are adequate to the decent maintenance of his wife without throwing the burthen upon the community. But how can the son of the countess, lord Normanby, tolerate such disgrace—for disgrace it is for any one to touch unnecessarily a shilling of the public money while on every side persons are dying of absolute want, and the entire peasantry of the country has resorted to the desperate expedient of destroying property, as the only alternative for extorting the bare means of subsistence. The last time we heard of the literary exquisite he was at Florence, amusing himself, with others of the 36,000 absentees, in acting plays.	
Napier, Louisa Mary, pension on civil list, 1805	251
Napier, Catherine, Caroline, and Sophia, each on civil list ..	97
Nairne, lord, pension on civil list, 1822	184
Nairne, Caroline, baroness, pension on civil list, 1829	184
Nelson, lady, pension, by act of parliament	2000

Nelson, earl, pension, by act of parliament	£5000
Brother of admiral Nelson. A striking instance this of the injustice of hereditary honours. The present possessor, a Norfolk parson, could have had as little claim to the rewards of the hero of the Nile, as any other chance person picked up in St. Paul's-church yard.	
Nepean, sir M. H. clerk of supreme court, Jamaica	1850
Nepean, Margaret, pension on civil list, Nov. 1792	501
Nesbit, S. secretary and registrar, Bahamas	1186
Newcastle, Ann, duchess dowager of, pension on c. l. 1803 ..	780
We have recorded several countesses and a marchioness, and this is the second pauper duchess. There is an act of Elizabeth which renders it imperative on children, when of sufficient ability, to maintain their parents, and we see no reason why the duke of Wellington, the duke of Manchester, and his grace of Newcastle should be exempt from its operation. Mr. Sadler who purposes trying his hand at the poor laws, will not, we trust, suffer this matter to escape attention, and his Newark patron be compelled to discharge his filial obligations.	
Newenham, Thomas, pension on Irish civil list, 1792	177
Newenham, Robert C. Callaghan, pension on Irish c. l. 1792 ..	88
Newenham, Mary, pension on Irish civil list, 1792	177
Newburgh, Mary, pension on civil list, 1782	177
Newcome, George W. late clerk in the comptrollers of army accounts office, June 1826	583
Late commissioner of lottery, June 1827	150
Neyle, G. N. auditor of accounts of registrar, Admiralty....	500
Retired allowance as commissioner of stamps	600
Nicholls, colonel G. royal engineers, Nova Scotia	1195
Nicholl, sir J. M.P. for Bedwyn; judge of the arches and prerogative courts of Canterbury, about	3350
Nicolay, major-general, governor of Dominica	2565
The father of the general, we believe, was a German, a violin player, and great favourite of queen Charlotte, with whom he came over to this country.	
Nicolay, Mary Georgiana, pension on civil list, 1818	322
Nicolay, Augusta Louisa, pension on civil list, 1813	130
Noble, H. clerk in office of home secretary	925
Allowance as late naval officer, Newfoundland	379
Norbury, lord, late chief justice of common pleas, Ireland....	3046
Norris, John F. fourth senior clerk in the treasury	679
Norman, R. receiver-general of taxes, Leicester	500
Northesk, earl of; rear-admiral of Great Britain, and commander-in-chief at Plymouth	3290
Northland, visc. joint prothonotary of common pleas, Ireland ..	3575
Nugent, gen. sir G., M.P. for Buckingham, col. 6th foot, pay ..	613
Captain of St. Mawes	102
Nugent, C. R. consul-general in Chili	2500
Oakes, O. R. receiver-general of taxes, Suffolk	600
O'Brien, Madelena, widow, pension on c. l. 1818	155
O'Connell, Louisa and Alicia, pension c. l. Dec. 1821, each ..	23

740 PLACES, PENSIONS, SINECURES, AND GRANTS.

O'Callaghan, major-gen. sir R. col. 97th foot	£494
Commanding forces in North Britain, staff pay	1183
O'Connor, A. distributor of stamps for Antrim	1076
O'Gorman, C. T. consul general at Mexico	2000
Ogle, rear-admiral sir Charles, commander-in-chief at Halifax and Newfoundland	2190
Ogle, J. W. cocket writer, customs	1103
O'Grady, S. late chief baron exchequer, Ireland	3500
O'Neil, J. B. brother of earl of O'Neil, M.P. for Antrimshire, a major-general, and constable of Dublin castle....	no return
Oliphant, Anthony, attorney-general, Cape of Good Hope....	1500
Oldham, Adam, deputy judge advocate ; superannuation	400
O'Reilly, M. J. pension on c. l. 1812	222
Osborn, sir J. commissioner of audit.....	1200
Oswald, lieut.-gen. sir J. col. 35th foot.....	1287
Otway, rear-admiral sir R. W. commander-in-chief, South America, (part of the year).....	1367
Ottley, sir R. chief justice, Ceylon	4500
Ouseley, sir G. late ambassador to Persia	2000
Owen, rear-admiral sir E. W. C. R. commander-in-chief, East Indies	2190
Oxenford, W. clerk to register of debentures, customs.....	1190
Pack, Arthur, Denis, Elizabeth, and Catherine, each, pension on c. l. 1825	100
Page, T. receiver-general of taxes, Surrey.....	600
Paget, gen. hon. sir E. col. 28th foot	1062
Governor of the royal military college	1500
Pension for loss of a limb	400
Paget, rear-admiral sir Charles, commander-in-chief, Ireland	2190
Paget, hon. B. commissioner of excise	1400
Paget, sir A. late ambassador to the Ottoman Porte.....	2000
Palmer, lady Madelina, pension on c. l. 1801	184
Palmerston, visc. secretary of state, foreign affairs	6000
Palk, Robert, commissioner of bankrupts, <i>July</i> 1828	350
Counsel to Duchy of Lancaster	unknown
Palgrave, W. collector of customs, Dublin	1200
Papendiech, Augusta Amelia, pension c. l. 1827	100
Parish, W. consul general and chargé d'affaires at Buenos Ayres	3795
Parish, W. commissioner of excise	1400
Parsons, Mary, pension on civil list, 1813	177
Parsons, Thomas, postmaster, Waterford	580
Parke, sir James, one of the judges of the king's bench	5500
Parks, Wm. pension on civil list, 1794.....	321
Parker, lieut.-col. J. B. captain royal artillery, 1825	239
2d captain gent. cadets, 1822	120
Pension for loss of leg, 1816.....	300

Parkinson, John, consul at Pernambuco	£1751
Passmore, U. consul at Arequipa	1265
Pasley, C. lieu.-col. royal engineers, <i>Dec.</i> 1814.....	310
Extra pay, inspector field works, Chatham, <i>May</i> 1812	310
Pension for a wound, <i>June</i> 1814	300
Allowance for servants	54
Patteson, sir J. puisne judge court of king's bench	5500
Pakenham, hon. T. late master general ordnance, Ireland....	1107
Pakenham, Richard, secretary of legation in Mexico, and chargé d'affaires ditto	2825
Parnell, lady C. pension out of 4½ per cent. duties, <i>July</i> 1821	200
Parks, W. pension on civil list, 1794.....	333
Payne, gen. sir W. col. 3d dragoon guards	1424
Peacock, M. B. solicitor to the post-office	1800
Pêche, J. clerk ordnance department.....	500
Pechell, capt. sir Samuel, M.P. for Hallestone; a lord of the admiralty.....	1000
Peel, sir Robert, M.P. for Tamworth, late secretary of state for the home department.....	

Of late years we have often had occasion to speak of sir Robert, and have mostly reported favourably of his intentions and abilities. But we shall now wash our hands of him. That he could ever so far degrade our gracious king, by recommending, or suffering himself for a moment to form part of a ministry that had recommended such a speech as the one with which his majesty opened parliament, fills us with astonishment. In this business we blame the Baronet more than the Duke; the latter is a soldier merely, and some excuse may be found for his prepossessions in favour of the Polignac system; but the former has always been a civilian, and never slaughtered any thing beyond hares and partridges:—he ought to have known better the signs of the times, the change in sentiment among the middling orders, and that it was absolute insanity to think of foreign intervention, and of resorting to alien bills, espionage, habeas corpus suspension acts, bank restriction act, and other et ceteras of the Pitt machinery, for the purpose of putting down internal discontent. Did we need any thing further to convince us that sir R. Peel is a very tiny statesman, and much better qualified for a peerage than premiership, it would be his *last words* before the Christmas recess, (House of Commons, Dec. 20) exhibiting his general views, and comprising such a brainless display of common place stuff, conceit, affected candour, and dowager politics, as we never before read, nor ever hope to read a second time.

We have left out the Baronet's retiring pension, for the same reason we left out that of the earl of Aberdeen. Sir Robert is rich, and may be disposed to save us from the additional burthen; and we are more inclined to think such will be the case, as we find none of his family on the pension list.

Next to the judicial reforms, the most praiseworthy act of sir R. Peel is the introduction of the bill which bears his name; and we cannot help expressing our surprise at the errors of Messrs. Atwood, Sadler, sir F. Burdett, sir James Graham, and we believe, too, the premier is slightly smitten with the same blindness—on so plain a matter as the restoration of the currency. The whole *rationale* of the question lies in a nutshell. The power of bankers to

issue paper gave them an uncontrolled influence over prices, wages, and profits; this power, in the eagerness to gain on their issues, they abused, fostered a pernicious system of credit, gave an artificial impulse to over-trading and speculation, which were followed by the disastrous revulsions witnessed in the years 1811, 1815-16, 1819, and 1825.

Such were the evils of the banking system. What was the remedy? The issue of small notes of less value than five pounds was interdicted; the amount of this denomination of notes in circulation never exceeded six millions; and when they were withdrawn they were replaced with sovereigns, so that there was no diminution or next to none, in the amount of the circulation. What national calamity, then, could flow from this transition, from the transmutation of six millions of rag-money into an equivalent gold currency?

We know there has been a great collapse in the mercantile world since 1826—it has been felt in every part of England, but it is the greatest error ever committed—if error it be—to ascribe it to the withdrawal of the small notes. It has been caused by the *destruction of private credit*—of that baseless and vicious credit, of which the banking system had been the parent, and to which some would again resort as a remedy.

Here are the facts. In 1825 the circulation consisted of specie, bank-notes, and mercantile paper, amounting altogether to about 420 millions. The small notes, amounting to about one-seventh part of the bank paper issued, and to one-seventienth part of the whole circulation, was withdrawn, and sovereigns substituted. And what then? Could this cause a deficiency in the circulating medium? could it cramp the operations of industry and trade, and check individual enterprise? or could it have any sensible effect in lowering the prices of commodities? Certainly not; even if there had been no equivalent issue of specie.

But this was the way it operated. Upon the little pivot of small notes an immense superstructure of kite-flying, bills, and private paper, to the amount of 380 millions, had been erected, all of which tumbled down on the shrinking of bank paper, and consequent ruin of domestic credit. By this means was the death of the paper system hastened, but not produced; the catastrophe was impending before, since the system had been carried to its utmost limit, and would have fallen upon this country, as it fell upon France in the course of last summer, though Peel's bill had never been introduced.

The cause of mercantile depression has not been a scarcity of small notes, but a scarcity of bills of exchange, and there is a want of bills, because there is a want of credit; there is a want of credit, because there is want of objects on which capital can be profitably employed; there is a want of objects on which capital can be profitably employed, because there are heavy taxes, tithes, corn-laws, commercial monopolies; and there are these evils, because there is an unreformed parliament.

If our readers will only excuse this hasty sketch, we shall leave it just as it is. Were we to proceed, we should only repeat our ideas. One word, however, on a recent observation of Lord Grey, whom we should be sorry to see commit a mistake on the subject. His lordship has intimated that, it is rather strange small notes should circulate without mischief in Scotland and Ireland, and not in England. Why now, in the first place, Scotland has a somewhat better system of banking; but let it proceed, and mind if it does not ultimately prove as rotten and ruinous as it ever did in England. But contrast the different circumstances of

the three kingdoms, and compare the wealth, the population, the manufacturing and mercantile transactions of England with those of Ireland and Scotland. A system of banking, which may be safe, manageable, and wholesomely stimulative of commercial, manufacturing, and rural industry in the latter, may, in the former, be unnecessary and destructive of national wealth and prosperity.

Penson, John, commissioner of bankrupts, 1811	£350
Cursitor of court of chancery	unknown
Penn, R. agent for Ceylon	800
Retired allowance as late clerk	750
Penn, R. pension on consolidated fund	1000
Penn, John, hereditary pension on consolidated fund	3000
This pension is a parliamentary compensation granted to the Penn family, to indemnify them for the loss of territorial rights in Pennsylvania, consequent on the separation of the American colonies from the English government.	
Pennefather, R. baron of the exchequer, Ireland	3692
Pennefather, E. attorney-general of Ireland	3000
Pennefather, John, William, Mary, Catharine, and Margaret, pension each, on Irish c. l. 1771	26
Pelham, hon. Catharine, widow, pension c. l. 1818	233
Pemberton, C. receiver general of taxes, Cambridge	500
Pent, Maria, pension on civil list, <i>July</i> 1820	155
Pennell, Rosamond, pension on civil list, 1830	100
Pennell, William, consul at Rio	1350
Pennington, Geo. Jos. commissioner of bankrupts, 1823	350
Steward of courts to Eton college and deputy recorder of Lincoln	—
Perceval, D. M. junior clerk teller's office	520
Perceval, Spencer, teller of the exchequer	2700
Percy, hon. A. minister plenipotentiary at Berne	2900
Percy, hon. W. H. commissioner of excise	1400
Perry, R. superintendent of mail coaches	840
Pemberton, C. R. assistant clerk in treasury, and private secretary to one of the secretaries, <i>Jan.</i> 1821	495
Agent for Russian Dutch loan, <i>Dec.</i> 1827	300
Phipps, gen. hon. E. brother of earl of Mulgrave, and M.P. for Scarborough; col. 60th foot (2d bat.)	782
Clerk of deliveries of ordnance	1018
Phillip, S. M. under secretary of state, home office	2000
Pickford, Jacob, pension on civil list, 1776	222
Pierrepoint, hon. H. late envoy, &c. to Stockholm	1200
Pilkington, major-gen. R. unattached major-gen. royal engineers, Gibraltar	1742
Pigot, gen. H. col. 82d foot, pay and emoluments	1073
Pigott, W. receiver of taxes, Bucks	500
Planta, Joseph, M.P. for Hastings; pension <i>Aug.</i> 1827	1500
Planta, Barbara, pension on civil list, 1827	200

Plumer, Thomas H. commissioner of bankrupts, 1819	£350
Clerk of the petty bag, chancery, 1820	unknown
One of examiners in chancery, 1821	2000
Plunkett, W. commissioner of excise	1400
Plunkett, hon. David, prothonotary common pleas, Ireland ..	1384
Plunkett, lord, lord chancellor of Ireland	9834

We think the Whigs have done themselves harm by their law arrangements in Ireland. To make way for O'Doherty in the common pleas, they purchased, by the bribe of a peerage, the retirement of the chief baron; a judge who, in 1823, was publicly charged in the house of commons with having perverted his judicial office to the illegal extortion of fees, and so strong was the *prima facie* evidence in support of the allegation, that lord Brougham, and others of the ministry, voted in favour of investigation. It is true O'Grady was acquitted; but the bare suspicion of pecuniary taint in a judge ought for ever to preclude him from the highest honours of the crown.

The elevation of lord Plunket to the chancellorship is still more reprehensible, involving the sacrifice of an important judicial principle, and honour to an individual, who, in our opinion, has very little claim to public gratitude and distinction.

Sir Anthony Hart was wholly unexceptionable—almost the *beau ideale* of what a judge should be—unconnected with politics—and discharging his high duties with the same singleness of mind that admiral Blake commanded the fleet during the time of the Commonwealth—intent only upon faithfully executing his individual trust, regardless of the intrigues and mutations of party and faction. Ought such a person to have been removed, to make way for a successor—who is partizanship, ambition, and avarice personified? If lord Plunket possess abilities, why were they not as available to the service of the country in his former situation, as in his present appointment. Are all our public men so void of patriotism—so degraded in principle—such sordid hirelings, that not one can be found to serve the community, unless he first receive a place, title, pension, or patronage to the full value of his labour?

No adequate reason has been assigned for this judicial movement. It has, indeed, been hinted, that it is intended to strengthen the councils of the marquis of Anglesea; but the lord chancellor is not the official adviser of the viceroy; that is the duty of the chief secretary, and the attorney and solicitor general; and it is only on particular occasions the head of the court of equity is resorted to. Lord Plunket will have the appointment of the magistracy; but for this office he does not appear so unexceptionable a medium as sir A. Hart.

The Whigs have incurred as much unpopularity in this transaction, as they did on a former occasion, by the introduction of lord Ellenborough into the cabinet. And what advantage can they hope to gain by the conciliation of lord Plunket? The country is now more in need of political honesty than splendid abilities; and the Irish chancellor will certainly bring them no accession of character. For our part, we always looked upon him as a mere huckster for place, who would never render the smallest service to the country unless adequately paid for it. For the last three years no one has heard of him, either as judicial reformer or statesman; and solely, as far as we could learn, because he deemed his appointment in the common pleas not an adequate price for his services. Here was disinterested patriotism! Look again at his conduct in

1821, when included in the *sale* of the Grenvillites, he joined the Liverpool administration, and, after receiving the attorney-generalship as the price of apostacy, openly abandoned Catholic emancipation, under the flimsy pretext that it was not the *proper time* to agitate the question.

Lord Plunket's notions on church property are not worth answering, being obviously at variance with the most obvious truths of history and analogy. It is not likely, however, an adventurer of such mercenary politics will flinch on this question, especially after fastening so many members of his family on the ecclesiastical establishment of Ireland.

Plaskett, T. H. chief clerk home office	£1329
Pollen, R. one of the six clerks in chancery	1217
Ponsonby, major-gen. hon. F. C. inspecting field officer.....	383
Lieutenant governor of Malta	4000
Pension for wounds.....	300
Ponsonby, lord, late envoy and min. plenipo. at Rio de Janeiro	2511
Ponsonby, Sarah, pension on civil list, 1829	200
Porter, sir R. Ker, consul at Caraccas	1261
Porrett, R. chief clerk storekeeper's office.....	750
Portmore, earl of, pension on English civil list, 1825	233
Well known in the gay world some years ago as lord Milsington. He has also £276 on the Scotch civil list.	
Polchet, Alfonse, professor of fortification, military academy..	297
Pope, C. surveyor of warehouses, Bristol	500
Pope, rev. E. archdeacon of Jamaica.....	2000
Popham, Elizabeth M. out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties.....	500
Power, D. protector of slaves, Berbice	1017
Poulett, hon. G. flag captain of H. M. S. "Prince Regent" ..	799
Late receiver general of taxes.....	400
Pringle, lieut.-gen. sir W. H. nephew to the earl of St. Germans, and M.P. for Liskeard; col. 64th foot.....	1245
Price, J. collector of revenue, Ceylon	1173
Price, J. pension on civil list, 1821	200
Pressly, C. secretary to board of stamps	700
Pugh, John, clerk to master Wilson, in chancery	1520

There are ten masters in chancery, with average incomes of £4500, and each master has a chief clerk with an income of £1200 or £1500 a year. These incomes, like most other judicial emoluments in equity, arise almost entirely from fees paid by suitors, and it is worthy of remark that while the emoluments have increased two or three fold, the time devoted to the public has in a similar inverse proportion decreased. That some reform is needed here there can be no doubt. With respect to the salaries of Mr. Pugh and his brother clerks they are made up in a most objectionable manner: there is a head called "*gratuities*," under which the chief portion of them are derived. In one office the fees amount to £500 and the gratuities to £800, and in others they present a similar disproportion. Such gratuities are indefensible, for they are sums given—levied we should say—to expedite business, which ought to be done expeditiously without them.

Pulleine, H. P. receiver-general of taxes, York	713
---	-----

Radcliffe, John, judge of the prerogative court, Ireland.....	£3000
Radstock, Cornelia, baroness, pension on civil list, 1814	389
Ram, Abel and Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1827	95
Ramshaw, John, clerk in the secretary's office, customs	550
Registrar of officer's sureties	600
Rae, dame Mary, pension on civil list, 1830	660

This is a grant made by, but since the duke of Wellington dismissed himself from office. The lady is the wife of the late lord advocate for Scotland,—an official legal situation resembling our attorney-general as public prosecutor. The only pretext for such a pension is, that this gentleman has lost his practice, that he gave up the office of sheriff-depute, worth some £600 a year, and that a seat in parliament being held essential for the office, he has been put to considerable expense in procuring it. A pity may be felt for the lady, but is the public deserving of no compassion? Let sir William have the sheriff-deputeship that falls vacant, and let dame Rae be provided for as other dames are, whose husbands do not sell themselves to ministers.

Raper, C. C. clerk in war-office	800
Paymaster of pensions to widows and children of foreign officers.....	250
Rattray, J. C. baron of the exchequer, Scotland	2000
Raynsford, T. A. registrar in chancery	4861

Of this enormous income £4201 arose from fees payable by suitors for copying and registering proceedings in equity. Lord Eldon, for upwards of a quarter of a century, sat cowering over the abuses of chancery, like a miser over his hoard, and would neither touch them himself nor suffer them to be touched by any other person. In 1826 the attorney-general, afterwards lord Lyndhurst, professed his intention to bring in a bill on the subject, but no such bill ever saw the light. Afterwards, however, he introduced an illusive measure, which did not embrace half the objects he originally professed; and the unfortunate suitors were left to be fleeced as heretofore, and more unmercifully than any poor gudgeon is who ventures within the precincts of the most nefarious gaming-house in the metropolis. With respect to the registrars, they are in keeping with most branches of our political and judicial administration, presenting a vast accumulation of abuse and emoluments since the commencement of the revolutionary war. From a parliamentary report of 1813 it appears that in the year 1797 the senior registrar received the annual sum of £1134, and the whole fees of the office did not exceed £4847. Mr. Raynsford alone, it seems, receives more than the whole amount of these fees; and the fees of the entire registrar's office have increased to £19,119 per annum, (Parliamentary Paper, No. 23, Sept. 1830-1.) And how has this increase been produced? It has been produced by enlarging the pleadings' bills to such an extent as to allow the enormous charges to be incurred in their registry, which is the consequence of the unnecessary length to which proceedings in chancery are extended. Besides their regular emoluments each registrar has the liberty of taking a clerk, without previous examination, for which he receives a fee of about £1000, and this person succeeds to the office.

Reade, sir T. consul general, Tunis	1800
Reade, W. assistant to collector, outwards.....	1000
Ready, John and Charles, pension on Irish civil list, 1817, each	177

Reay, Eric, baron, pension on civil list, 1804	£184
Renny, Dr. G. director general of hospitals, physician and surgeon to Kilmainham-hospital	1296
Renny, W. solicitor of legacy duties, Scotland	500
Renny, Mary, Elizabeth, and Isabella, pension on civil list, 1821, each	88
Reid, J. clerk and chamberlain of Lindores	457
Reed, S. secretary to medical board	500
Reynolds, J. G. clerk commissary dept. of treasury	700
Reynolds, J. S. clerk of securities, treasury	1050
Richmond, duke of, postmaster general	2500
The office of postmaster-general has been abolished in Ireland; one of the two, formerly existing, has been dropped in England, and the other is little better than a sinecure. The same may be observed of the postmaster-general of Scotland. The duties are done by the secretaries who receive ample remuneration.	
Richmond, Henry, commissioner of customs	1400
For loss of fees	800
Rich, sir Geo. pension on civil list, 1817	132
Rickman, John, clerk assistant, house of commons	2500
Richardson, sir J. late justice of the king's bench	3500
Richardson, Fanny, Elizabeth, and Sarah, pension on c. l. 1824	101
Richards, R. commissioner of bankrupts	350
Accountant-general and master, court of exchequer ..	1820
Richards, H. solicitor of stamps, Scotland	1000
Ricketts, C. M. consul-general at Lima	1600
Ricketts, maj. H. J. royal African corps, pay	292
Lieut.-governor of Sierra Leone	2095
Ricketts, G. W. receiver-general of taxes, Southampton	600
Ricketts, Mrs. S. pension out of 4½ per cent. fund, <i>July</i> 1820 ..	411
Ripley, J. J. principal clerk, customs	650
Rippon, T. agent at the bank for national debt	300
Ritemeyer, R. J. colonial receiver, Demerara	1571
Roberts, W. commissioner of bankrupts, 1812	350
Commissioner for inquiry into charities, 1818	1000
Roberts, W. H. receiver of fees, exchequer	1350
Rogers, F. L. inspector in the audit-office	800
Robertson, W. late lord of session, Scotland	1500
Robinson, lieut.-gen. sir F. P. colonel 59th foot, pay and emoluments	1171
Robinson, C. collector of customs, Demerara	2000
Robinson, sir C. judge of the high court of admiralty	2402
Robinson, J. R. chief justice, Upper Canada	1500
Robinson, Catharine, pension on civil list, 1793	407
Roche, dame Mary, pension on civil list, 1801	354
Rodney lord, hereditary pension, by act of parliament	2923
The admiral might have deserved this pension; but titles should not be granted with a perpetual charge on them. This pension	

originally was £2000, but increased £1000, to put the present possessor on a level with earl St. Vincent and viscount Duncan, and with them should be reduced.	
Rodney, hon. John, chief secretary, Ceylon	£3200
Rodney, hon. W. secretary comptroller, army accounts office..	700
Rodney, John, Jane, Ann, Sarah, and Catharine, pension on civil list, 1781, each	88
Roden, earl of, late auditor of the exchequer, Ireland	2700
Lord of the bedchamber	810
Rodmell, Thomas, comptroller of customs, Hull.....	600
Roe, W. T. commissioner of customs	1400
Steward of the Savoy	15
Roe, F. A. police justice Great Marlborough Street	800
Rooke, dame H. pension on civil list, 1808	233
Rook, Jane and Mary, pension on civil list, 1816, each	60
Rollo, Isabella and Mary, pension on civil list, 1807	184
Rolland, Adam, principal clerk of session, Scotland	1000
Clerk to his majesty's processes, Scotland	40
Rolleston, H. clerk in foreign secretary's office.....	880
Romilly, C. commissioner of bankrupts, 1830	350
Rose, sir George, M.P. for Christchurch; clerk of parliament	3300
Rose, Geo. Pitt, son of preceeding, M.P. for Christchurch; captain in 15th hussars	
Rose, Theodore, pension on civil list, 1785	233
Rose, Ann Fraser, pension on civil list, 1803	92
Rose, Mary, pension on civil list, 1808	97
Ross, major-gen. J. commanding at Guernsey and Alderney, staff pay as colonel	560
Pay and emoluments as lieut.-governor of Guernsey ..	627
Unattached pay as lieut.-colonel	310
Pension for injuries received in service	350
Ross, C. B. commissioner of the navy, Plymouth.....	1000
Ross, sir Patrick, governor of Antigua	4859
Ross, Charlotte, widow, pension on civil list, 1823	194
Rosslyn, gen. earl of, col. of 9th dragoons.....	1415
Keeper of privy seal, Scotland	2193
Director of chancery, Scotland	1852
Rothsay, lord Stuart de, late ambassador to Paris	2500
Roscommon, countess of, pension on civil list, 1817.....	88
Roscommon, earl of, pension on civil list, 1829.....	192
Rotton, J. deputy comptroller general, excise	600
Roths, G. W. earl of, pension on civil list, 1821	270
Roths, Charlotte, dowager countess of, pension on c. l. 1817	155
Pension on civil list, 1821	276
Routh, commissary-general in the Canadas	1862
Rowan, lieut.-col. Charles, commissioner of metropolitan police	800
Rowley, O. secretary and registrar, Malta.....	1044

Rowley, D. receiver-general of taxes, Huntingdon	£400
Rudlen, J. second clerk to auditor of land revenue	710
Rumbold, Emily and Caroline, pension on civil list, 1826, each	115
Russell, W. commissioner of bankrupts, 1828	350
Deputy recorder of Bedford	
Russell, lord John, paymaster of the forces	2000

It were hardly possible for earl Grey to have fixed on a nicer little man for paymaster than the third son of our grace of Bedford. But we cannot say we exactly like the flavour of lord John's speeches since he entrenched himself on the sunny side of St. Stephen's; they smack too strongly of the common place pretexts for profusion, with which we have been too long familiar from orators on the treasury benches. His lordship on one occasion ventured even to insinuate an apology for the shameless cost of foreign embassies, and hinted that the pension roll was a mere flea-bite. If the right hon. lord will only condescend to look at page 401 of our publication, he will find he labours under a trifling mistake in this matter, and that the sums paid in pensions merely, is more than double the produce of taxes on newspapers and advertisements, and which as a friend to the diffusion of knowledge, and member of a society instituted expressly for the purpose, he must needs deem a serious consideration: but the waste of public money is not all in this matter; it is the political and moral consequences—the vicious influence it creates—the corrupt expectancies excited—and the encouragement of immorality, and political prostitution to which it has been often made subservient.

Ruthven, Wilhelmina, pension on civil list, 1801	230
St. Albans, duke of, hereditary grand falconer	1372
Hereditary registrar of court of chancery	640
St. George, C. M. secretary and chargé d'affaires at Turin ..	1401
St. George, Maria and Jane, pension on civil list, 1828	144
St. John, Henry, pension on civil list, 1780	101
St. John, R. W. consul-general, Algiers	2000
St. Helens, lord, late ambassador to Russia	2300
Gentleman of the king's bedchamber	712
St. Vincent, viscount, pension on consolidated fund	3000

The uncle, who was a successful naval commander and meritorious first lord of the admiralty, might deserve the pension, but his successor, the nephew of the admiral, can have no claim on the public.

Sandon, viscount, son of earl of Harrowby, and M.P. for Tiver- ton; secretary to the India board	2000
Sandford, Frances, pension on civil list, 1830	97
Sansoni, L. collector of customs, Ceylon	1025
Sargent, William, principal clerk in the treasury	1500
Sargeant, J. late commiss. for auditing public accounts, 1821 ..	800
Late secretary to the treasury, 1804	600
Sargent, Mrs. C. pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties, <i>May</i> 1804 ..	610
Salkeld, George, consul at New Orleans	1136
Sanford, Henry, senior clerk in the treasury	1000
Saurin, Edw. commissioner of stamps, 1826	1000
Half-pay as captain in the navy, 1819	57

Saurin, M. A. solicitor to excise, Ireland	£1500
Saumarez, vice-adm. sir J. vice-adm. of Great Britain, and admiral of the white	1230
Pension, by act of parliament	1200
Saunders, E. clerk in commissariat	511
Clerk in office for civil list accounts, 1816	200
Sayer, B. comptroller of accounts, tax-office	1131
Sellon, J. B. police justice, Hatton Garden	800
Seppings, sir R. surveyor of the navy	1000
Pension	400
Selwyn, Charlotte, Albinia, Louisa, and Henrietta, pension on civil list, 1807, each	81
Semphill, hon. Maria and Sarah, pension each, 1826	49
Semphill, Hugh, lord, pension on civil lists, 1826	97
Sewell, hon. Harriet, pension on civil list, 1821	88
Sewell, J. pension out of consolidated fund	1000
Sewell, Jonathan, chief justice Quebec, and speaker legislative council	2400
Seward, lieut.-gen. T. colonel commandant royal artillery	1003
Seymour, G. H. secretary of embassy, Constantinople	1909
Seymour, lord George, chairman of the excise board	2000
The chairmen and commissioners of the boards of excise, customs, stamps, and taxes, are mostly filled by members of the aristocratical families. The Liverpool administration was pre-eminent for the lavish grant of pensions and increase of salaries. By an order of the lords of the treasury in 1816, the salaries of the chairmen of customs and excise were augmented from £1700 to £2000 a year, and the junior members of the two boards from £1200 to £1400 a year. By a treasury minute, dated 20th Feb. 1830, the salaries of the chairmen and commissioners are ordered to be reduced, on the occurrence of vacancies, £200 per annum; but this is by no means the amount of reduction to which they ought to be subjected, in consequence of the increased value of money and their unreason- able augmentation. But why wait for vacancies before any saving can be effected?	
Seymour, lord H. compensation allowance for loss of office of <i>craner and wharfinger</i> , port of Dublin	1251
Seymour, capt. sir M. commissioner of the naval yard, Ports- mouth	1100
Scarlett, sir W. chief justice, St. Lucia	2500
Scott, W. L. F. registrar of deeds for West Riding of Yorkshire	1200
Scott, W. H. J. son of lord Eldon, receiver of fines, court of chancery, for the year ending 1830	240
Registrar of affidavits, court of chancery	1816
Clerk of the letters patent, court of chancery	553
Scott, sir Walter, principal clerk of session, and sheriff of the shire of Selkirk, Scotland	1600
For loss of fees under 50 Geo. III. c. 112	300
Scott, H. R. collector of customs and provincial judge, Ceylon	1041

Scott, sir David, pension on civil list, 1827	£300
Are the magisterial services of this gentleman at Brighton so valuable as to deserve this pension?	
Scott, Ann Lindsay, pension on civil list, 1825	250
Scott, dame Harriet, pension on civil list, 1802	84
Schenley, E. W. H. consul at Hayti	1200
Schomberg, heir of the duke of, hereditary pension out of post-office revenue	4000
One of king William's followers, and killed, it is supposed, by a random shot from his own troops at the battle of the Boyne. There is no peerage of the name, and to whom the pension is paid, or for what, we are unable to ascertain.	
Scovell, sir Geo. col. lieutenant-governor of military college, 1829	383
Lieut.-col. royal waggon train	599
Scovell, C. assistant secretary, customs	1200
Shadwell, sir Launcelot, vice chancellor	6000
Shaftesbury, earl of, chairman of committees, house of lords ..	3000
Shannon, earl of, late clerk of the pells, Ireland	3133
Shawe, lieut.-col. Merrick, pension on civil list, 1824	500
Pension on Irish civil list, 1825	499
We are not aware of any claims col. Shawe had to his pensions further than court favour and having acted as private secretary to the marquis Wellesley. It seems the regular practice of noble lords to throw their private secretaries on the public: this example was followed by the duke in the cases of Messrs. Drummond and Greville. Every want is to be provided for out of the taxes, whether it be for the support of an aged parent, sister, niece, illegitimate child, or cast-off mistress.	
Shaw, Robert, representative of, pension on civil list, 1786 ..	714
Sir R. Shaw, of Dublin, enjoys this pension; and he explains, that he <i>inherits</i> it; that it was "purchased," by his father, of course, upwards of forty-four years ago, and that he, of course, inherits it as executor of another. So that this pension may continue for ever, and be transmitted like a freehold estate. The famous pension of Edmund Burke has been sold many times; and if sir R. Shaw's doctrine be correct, some of these incumbrances may be perpetual; which is a notion we can hardly believe parliament will tolerate on the renewal of the Civil List.	
Shawe, Mary, Catharine, and Ann, pension on civil list, 1828	95
Sharp, sir C. collector of customs, Sunderland	600
Shepherd, sir S. late chief baron exchequer, Scotland	3000
Shepherd, H. John, commissioner of bankrupts, 1827	250
Judge advocate of fleet and counsel to admiralty, 1828	43
Recorder of Abingdon, 1818	
Clerk of custodies of lunatics in chancery, 1829	450
Clerk of presentations in chancery, 1829	43
Shee, sir J. under secretary of state	2000
Shee, dame Maria, pension on civil list, 1803	334
Sherwood, Susan, Rebecca, Ann, and Elizabeth, pension on civil list, each	15
Shield, W. late naval commissioner	950

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, Caroline, Jane, Thomas Berkeley, Frances, Charles, and Helen, pension on civil list, 1818, each	£ 57
Poor Sheridan's legacy to his friend George IV. who thus disposed of it. As the duke of Somerset's son (a staunch Whig) has married one of the family, he will, it is hoped, do something for his wife's relatives.	
Short, Charles, clerk of the rules and orders of the court of king's bench, <i>from fees</i>	5172
We are not exactly acquainted with the official duties of Mr. Short, but the nature of them and the sources of his vast emoluments require investigation. It is curious to remark that the greatest portion of public taxes is levied on articles of general consumption, and paid by the industrious classes; and the emoluments of the most lucrative judicial offices arise principally from fees paid out of the property of bankrupts, insolvents, and imprisoned debtors.	
Short, H. T. clerk, secretary of state's office, colonial	855
Agent for Trinidad	344
Shrapnell, maj.-gen. H. colonel commandant royal artillery ..	1003
Pension for inventions	1200
Sinclair, sir John, compensation on abolition of office of cashier of excise, Edinburgh	2000
From the incessant publications of this person, his duties of office could not have been very great, and we believe he never served any apprenticeship to entitle to compensation for loss of employment.	
Sinclair, lord Charles, pension on Scotch civil list, 1788	184
Sinclair, Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1775	138
Sinclair, lady Isabella, pension on civil list, 1790	115
Sinclair, Ann, pension on civil list, 1791	37
Sinclair, Catharine, pension on civil list, 1791	97
Sidmouth, viscount, late secretary of state	3000
Skinner, J. M. com. of a packet, Holyhead, <i>April</i> 1793 ..	800
Commander in the navy, <i>August</i> 1821	155
Slow, Ann and Catharine, pensioners on c.l. 1817, each	45
Smith, lieut.-col. sir C. F. royal engineers, West Indies	1234
Pension for wound	300
Smith, lieut.-gen. John, colonel commandant royal artillery ..	1003
Smith, major-gen. J. F. S. colonel, royal artillery, Ireland ..	1870
Smith, J. clerk Irish department treasury	1000
Pension for loss of office in Irish house of commons ..	304
Smith, G. secretary to the navy board	1200
Smith, W. commissioner of arbitration at Sierra Leone	1831
Smith, J. S. late envoy, &c. to Stutgard	1200
Smith, sir W. C. baron of the exchequer, Ireland	3692
Smith, admiral sir W. Sydney, pension on consolidated fund. .	1000
Ditto, four and-a-half per cent. fund	1250
Also a rear admiral	766
Smith, C. Culling, commissioner of customs	1400
Smith, lady Ann Culling, pension on civil list, 1812	600

Smith, Dame Carterette, ditto, 1813	£155
<p>The last is, probably, mother-in-law of the preceding, who is wife of sir George Culling Smith,—mother-in-law twice over to the marquis of Worcester, who married two of her daughters,—daughter to countess Mornington,—sister to marquis Wellesley,—ditto to lord Maryborough,—ditto to the duke of Wellington,—ditto to lord Cowley,—ditto to the rev. Dr. Wellesley, prebend of Durham, rector of Chelsea, rector of Bishop's Wearmouth, rector of Therfield, and who would, doubtless, have been a bishop, had he not, by such promotion, been obliged to relinquish more valuable preferments. With the public services of lady A. Smith we are as little acquainted as with those of any other of the host of relatives and cast off employes which the four peers of the Wellesley family have suffered to be placed on the pension list. It is not without reason Prince Arthur bears the <i>sword of state</i> on public occasions, and declared so stoutly against parliamentary reform; for his highness has obviously something to defend, and many stakes in the system besides Waterloo pensions.</p>	
Smith, P. clerk, secretary of state's office, colonial	726
Agent for Mauritius	500
Smith, R. receiver-gen. of taxes, Surrey	600
Smyth, sir J. C. baronet, unattached gen. officer, <i>July</i> 1825	479
Pension for good services, <i>Feb.</i> 1817	456
Governor of the Bahamas	2650
Smythe, the hon. G. A. F. S. pension on civil list, 1828.....	104
Smyth, James, collector of customs, Cork.....	1000
Smollet, Susan, pension on civil list, 1806	97
Soady, B. clerk in audit office	350
Pension for special services.....	100
Private secretary to chairman of audit board, 1826 ..	50
Somerset, lieut.-gen. lord R. E. H. col. 1st reg. of dragoons..	1520
Somerset, major-gen. lord, F. unattached pay as major-gen..	500
Military secretary to the general commanding in chief	2000
Pension for wound	300
Somerset, gen. lord C. H., col. 33d foot, pay and emoluments	1054
Somerville, William, physician, Chelsea hospital	576
Retired pay as inspector, medical department	187
Sergeant surgeon to the King	277
Sneyd, Elizabeth, and her daughter, pension on c. l. 1776 ..	445
Sneyd, Hannah, pension on c. l. 1781	266
Sneyd, Ann, pension on c. l. 1807	356
<p>These are Irish, and we wonder who they can be. There is a great wine-merchant, named Sneyd, who was in parliament, and who regularly voted with ministers.</p>	
Soane, John, clerk of the works, Chelsea hospital.....	749
South, William, clerk to registrar in chancery	1576
Southey, Robert, pension on civil list, 1807.....	155
Poet laureate	100
Sparshott, S. deputy comptroller, coast-guard	500
Commander in the navy, half-pay.....	155

Spencer, W. ordnance storekeeper, Portsmouth	£1002
Spearman, A. Y. assistant clerk of parliamentary accounts ..	875
First clerk, civil list audit-office	400
Spearman, A. and Margaret Young, pension on c. l. 1827 ..	120
Spicer, W. H. deputy treasurer, Chelsea hospital	1016
Spottiswoode, George, commandant Hibernian society, 1820	310
Pension for wounds, 1815	200
Half-pay as major in the army, 1816	173

Spottiswoode, Andrew, M. P. for Colchester; king's printer

no return

This gentleman, in partnership with Messrs. Eyre and Strahan, holds the valuable patent of King's printer, conferring the exclusive right to print acts of parliament, proclamations, bibles, books of common prayer, and works the copyright of which is vested in the crown. It is impossible to assign the annual profits accruing from this privilege; they must be very great as their bills against the treasury, ordinarily, amount to £30,000 or £40,000 per annum. Besides the profit from this source, they have another from the sale of acts to the public, above the number required by law to be delivered to the houses of parliament, the magistracy, and public bodies; and which profit has been estimated to amount to £30,000 per annum. It appears doubtful whether the terms of the patent entitle the grantees to the *bookseller's profit* on the sale of the acts of parliament; their privilege being restricted to the office of printer to the king.

The patent of Messrs. Eyre and Strahan expired in 1829, and report says, it has been renewed for another period of thirty years, without inquiry, or other terms being exacted than the old understood condition of one of the firm sitting in parliament and voting on all occasions with the treasury. If this report be correct, the profligacy of the arrangement can only be equalled by other acts which signalized the Wellington ministry, when, at the moment of dissolution, they thrust *en masse* on the pension list their private secretaries, parasites, and *attaches*, of a still less reputable description. We believe, however, certain formalities remain to be gone through before the grant is finally renewed; and from some expressions, which fell from Lord Althorp, previous to the Christmas recess, it is probable measures will be adopted to quash a monopoly which is at variance with the knowledge of the age, and the general policy of an enlightened government.

That the public sustains a great loss from the exclusive privileges of the king's printer is evident from the transactions with the late JOHN REEVES, esq. well known some forty years ago as the getter up of a loyal association for putting down republicans and levellers. Mr. Pitt was desirous of rewarding the services of this redoubtable champion of monarchical institutions; to have placed him openly on the pension list might have given rise to comments rendering questionable the purity of John's loyalty, which dilemma was avoided by the wary minister making it a condition of the renewal of the patent of the king's printer in 1799, that Mr. Reeves should be admitted a sort of sleeping partner, receiving for his share of the profits £1500 per annum. In 1807, Mr. Reeves became dissatisfied with the arrangement, having discovered that his share of the profits was far more considerable, amounting, according to the statement he made in a bill of discovery filed by him against his co-partner in the patent, to £6500 a year. The result of this proceeding was a more favourable agreement with the loyal associator against

levellers, the precise nature of which has not transpired. What we have said is perhaps sufficient to elucidate the privileges of the king's printer, the purposes to which they have been applied, and the propriety of their abolition.	
Spranger, J. commissioner of bankrupts, 1822.....	£350
Master of court of exchequer, 1820	no return
Speer, W. chief clerk in treasury and auditor.....	1700
Stack, Annabella and Mary, pension on c. l. 1828	66
Stace, W. ordnance storekeeper, Woolwich	680
Pension	365
Stanley, Edw. G. S. grandson of the earl of Derby; chief secretary for Ireland, salary and emoluments	4822
The chief secretary having been polled out of Preston, by Mr. Hunt, we shall be curious to see through what sink of corruption the right honourable gentleman will emerge into St. Stephen's. What times are these! The proud house of Derby, after holding the lord lieutenancy of the county palatine of Lancaster for half a century, beaten by a blacking-maker. These are rubs for the aristocracy, and show what a cracked concern it is.	
Stanley, Jane, pension civil list, 1799	356
Stanhope, A. comptroller of foreign office in the General Post office, emoluments paid by individuals	1915
Stanhope, lady H. Lucy, pension on $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties	900
The lady mentioned in page 140.	
Stanhope, Caroline, pension on civil list, 1805	155
Stables, Ann, widow, pension on civil list, 1821	200
Standish, Olivia and Diana, pension on civil list, 1815, each..	66
Stapleton, G. A. commissioner of customs	1400
Agent for Grenada	172
Clerk of the signet.....	300
Stapylton, hon. G. A. C. chairman of the victualling board ..	1200
Staniforth, J. distributor of stamps, Lancashire.....	1599
Stavely, John, 8th senior clerk in foreign office	635
Stephen, James, master in chancery	3700
Stephen, James, law adviser, colonial and board of trade	1500
Stephen, J. M. judge surrogate, St. Lucia	1046
Stephenson, B. C. surveyor-general of works	1500
Riding forester, New Forest	452
Stephenson, hon. Jane, pension on civil list, 1803	100
Stevens, C. clerk of introitus, pell-office, exchequer.....	950
Stevens, W. senior, military draftsman, Military-College	330
Sterky, Rev. Alexander, pension on civil list, 1816.....	400
Wherefore? Had the gentleman no parish?	
Sterling, Edward, pension on civil list, 1780	177
Stepney, Dame, pension on civil list, 1826	200
Stevellay, Jones, late six clerk chancery, Ireland	1498
Stewart, major-gen. D. governor, St. Lucia	2500
Stewart, hon. E. deputy chairman of the customs	1700
Stewart, hon. J. H. K. assistant secretary, treasury	2500

Stewart, R. H. 2d clerk in war-office	£333
Private secretary to deputy secretary at war	100
Stewart, lady Lucy, pension on civil list, 1806.....	184
Steward, Urian, pension on civil list, 1823	266
Stoddart, sir John, chief justice, Malta.....	1507
Stoddart, Jane and Caroline, pension on civil list, 1824	65
Stoddart, Susan, Ann, Barbara, Jean, and Mary, each pension on civil list; 1809	49
Stirling, James, consul at Leghorn	1061
Still, Peter, commissioner of bankrupts, 1793	350
Clerk of court of requests, Manchester, 1808	unknown
Stopford, admiral sir R. commander-in-chief at Portsmouth ..	2920
Stopford, lieut-gen. hon. sir E. colonel 41st foot, pay	613
Stockes, J. W. taxing officer common law business, Ireland ..	1107
Stone, William, master shipwright, Chatham	720
Stow, D. clerk of a road, in general post office—salary	530
Emoluments paid by individuals	1110
Stowell, lord, master in the faculty office	no return
<p>Lord Stowell retired from the court of admiralty in 1828, having presided there for the term of twenty years, and during the war his emoluments from the office of judge averaged £10,000 per annum. His lordship is the elder brother of lord Eldon, and in the eighty-sixth year of his age; his son-in-law, viscount Sidmouth—the <i>letter of thanks' man</i>—is in his seventy-fifth year.</p>	
Stuart, sir Simeon H. pension on civil list, 1822.....	200
Stuart, H. retired allowance as clerk, colonial office, 1816 ..	562
Secretary and registrar, St. Lucia, 1803	200
Stuart, Jane, pension on civil list, 1784.....	172
Stracey, sir Edward, clerk in house of commons, 1830.....	1382
Council to chairman of committees, house of lords	1582
Stratford, —, master in chancery	3948
Strangford, viscount, late ambassador to Russia.....	2300
Strangford, Maria, dowager vicountess, pension on English civil list, 1804	333
Ditto, pension on Irish civil list, 1809	266
Strangford, lord, pension on civil list, 1797	88
Strangford, viscount, daughter of, pension on civil list, 1764	222
Straton, lady Emily, pension on civil list, 1813.....	177
Straton, J. late Minister to Sweden	1500
Strathmore, lady Ann, pension on civil list, 1828.....	230
<p>If this lady be the wife of the present earl, is it because he may be always in difficulties, that the public should maintain her? If the widow of the late lord, it is more reprehensible, as she was married just in his dying moments, to rob his heirs of rank and fortune.</p>	
Sullivan, L. deputy secretary at war	200
Sullivan, J. A. provost marshal, Jamaica	1500
Sullivan, J. A. sec. registrar, and king's receiver, Demerara	7800
Sutherland, R. consul at Maracaibo	1250

Sutton, right hon. C. M. speaker of the house of commons ..	£6000
Surtees, William Villiers, commissioner of bankrupts, 1800..	350
Cursitor for Middlesex, clerk of the jurats, and filazer common pleas, 1799	no return
For loss of cursitorial fees in 1829, Mr Surtees received £1176. He is a relative of John, lord Eldon, see page 293.	
Swinton, Margaret, Mary, Isabel, Ann, and Harriet, pension on civil list, 1800	276
Talbot, George, paymaster of his majesty's household	800
Receiver general of taxes	600
Talbot, Robert, commissioner of bankrupts, 1793	350
Cursitor for London and Middlesex, <i>for loss of fees</i> ..	1176
Tapp, John W. storekeeper, Halifax, 1818	406
1st lieut. invalid artillery (reduced 1819), 1800	142
Tanner, T. clerk of ship's entries, customs	3232
Tarleton, gen. sir B. col. 8th dragoons, pay and emoluments..	1243
Governor of Berwick	647
Pension for wounds	300
Taunton, sir W. E. puisne judge of the court of king's bench	5500
Taylor, lieut.-gen. sir Herbert, colonel 85th foot	938
Adjutant general	1884
Pension on civil list, 1819	913
Private sec. and aid-de-camp to the king	no return
Taylor, gen. the hon. R. colonel, 6th dragoon guards	1578
Taylor, sir B. clerk of the signet, 1801	291
Envoy and minister plenipotentiary to Berlin, 1828..	5164
Taylor, T. deputy keeper of privy seal, Dublin, Aug. 1829..	73
Clerk in chief secretary's office, 1799	712
Taylor, T. comptroller general of customs	1000
Temple, the hon. W. secretary of embassy at St. Petersburg	1100
Tenterden, rt. hon. lord, chief justice of the court of king's bench	10000
Tennyson, Charles, M.P. for Blechingley, clerk of the or- nance	1200
Terrill, W. pension out of consolidated fund	1000
Thackeray, S. assistant solicitor, customs	800
Thomson, T. principal clerk of session, Scotland	1000
Deputy clerk register ditto	500
Thomson, W. deputy, commissary-general half-pay, 1818 ..	267
Prothonotary of Nova Scotia	600
Thomson, C. Poulett, M.P. for Dover, treasurer of the navy	3000
Vice-president of board of trade	2000
These offices have been consolidated by the new ministry, and Mr. Thomson receives only the salary of one. Now this gentleman is in office we trust he will not forget to bring forward the motion of which he gave notice last session for the reduction of the stamp duties on newspapers, and which would give more satisfaction than the hon. member's ex-officio repeal of the duties on barilla.	
Thompson, T. solicitor to post-office, Ireland	1457

Thornborrow, J. chief clerk in office of woods	£700
Thornton, J. chairman of the board of stamps	2012
Thornton, W. T. clerk of the securities, excise	600
Thornton, W. C. commissioner of hackney coaches	364
Lieutenant-governor of Hull	182
Aide-de-camp to the king	182
Pension and retired military allowance	591
Thornton, sir E. late envoy to Portugal	2000
Thornton, major-gen. W. staff-pay as major-gen. northern district, Ireland	868
Unattached pay as lieut. colonel	310
Thurlow, rev. Thomas, patentee for execution of bankrupt-laws; emolument from fees on commissions, writs of supersedeas, and proceedings in bankruptcy, for the year ending <i>Jan. 5, 1830</i>	8502
Clerk of hanaper in chancery; emoluments from <i>June 5, 1829, to Jan. 5, 1830</i>	1192
Prothonotary of the court of Chancery	97
Prothonotary of court of Durham	no return

A cluster of judicial sinecures like this in the hands, we believe, of one person, and that person a clergyman, requires elucidation. It has been often urged as a favourable trait in the English constitution that it allows the humblest individual possessed of merit to aspire to the highest rewards and offices in the state; but this advantage is in some measure counterbalanced by the principle which permits those rewards and honours to be hereditarily transmitted to descendants. Of the practical working of this part of the system the families of Marlborough, Nelson, and Thurlow afford striking examples. The founder of the honours of the last, it is well known was the lord chancellor of the name, and during the short period of sixty years, within which it emerged from the obscurity of a Suffolk parsonage, it has presented some very singular incongruities. Lord Chancellor Thurlow, whose father was the rector of Ashfield, died unmarried, but not before he had, by the influence of his office, pushed his brother Thomas into the rich see of Durham. This Thomas left two sons, Edward, the late peer, who succeeded the chancellor, and Thomas, in holy orders, who succeeded, on the death of his brother, in 1829, to the valuable reversion mentioned above. The claims of the two nephews to the honours and emoluments of their uncle the first Lord Thurlow, it would be invidious to investigate. Edward is chiefly known from having married Miss Bolton the actress, and from having been an unfortunate aspirant in verse-making; the fruits of his marriage were three sons, the eldest of whom is now in his seventeenth year, destined in due course to form one of our hereditary legislators. Of the rev. Thomas Thurlow, the rich revisionist, we know nothing further than that he has a son a respectable merchant of Norwich.

Tilson, J. H. receiver general of taxes, Oxford	500
Tindall, J. receiver general of taxes, York	600
Tierney, Mrs. pension on civil list, 1830	400

Widow of the late M.P. for Knaresborough, and who, if in need of assistance, ought to have obtained it from the wealthy banker,

her relative; or, if not from him, from the duke of Devonshire and other party connexions of her husband. But aristocracy is the grave of virtue. The rich lords, like the rich clergy, immersed in luxury and dissipation, are strangers to sympathy, with indigence and misfortune. They do not even provide for the destitute of their "order," and seldom come forward to support any work of utility or benevolence. There are exceptions among the nobility, but this is the general character of the *corporation*; all useful, meritorious, and charitable undertakings are planned, supported, and executed by the middling and industrious classes. It is the same in Ireland, as we learn from the parliamentary report of last session; there all institutions for the education of the people, and for their relief in sickness and old age, have been established and are supported, not by the absentee landlords, bishops, and pluralists, but by the farmer, the poor tenantry, and tradesmen. But can there need further proof of the vicious nature of aristocracy in church and state, than the deplorably ignorant and destitute state of our agricultural population? Of the one hundred and thirty-eight miserable creatures on the Berkshire calendar, only twenty-five could *write*, and only thirty-seven could *read*; yet, in face of this evidence of the neglect of the people by their "natural protectors," justices Park, Vaughan, and others of the special commissioners would insinuate the clergy and lords of the soil had done *their duty*, and that the risings of the peasantry did not proceed from want of food or want of education, but from the wicked machinations of seditious writers, itinerant lecturers, and foreign incendiaries.

Tighe, G. W. pension on Irish civil list, 1815.....	358
Tighe, Charlotte, pension on Irish civil list, 1828.....	47
Tildesley, Sophia, pension on civil list, 1825.....	61
Tomlins, A. clerk, Irish revenue, <i>Jan.</i> 1817.....	500
Private secretary to vice-treasurer, <i>Jan.</i> 1817.....	75
Allowance for assisting in completing index to journals of house of lords.....	400
Tomlins, sir Thomas, counsel to chief secretary, 1801.....	400
Counsel to treasury for Irish revenue.....	500
Pension on Irish civil list, 1825.....	168
For compiling index to acts relative to Ireland.....	200
Torrens, R. fourth justice in common pleas, Ireland.....	3692
Torrens, Dame Sarah, pension on civil list, 1820.....	624
This lady is the widow, probably, of the late general sir H. Torrens, adjutant-general. This officer was most fortunate in his advancement, and held high situations; but lived so extravagantly as to leave his family upon the public.	
Toole, J. deputy commissary-general, half-pay, 1817.....	267
Pension as civil auditor of Malta.....	91
Townsend, J. S. master in chancery in Ireland.....	3138
There are <i>nice pickings</i> in judicial offices in Ireland as well as in England and Scotland.	
Trafford, Trafford, receiver general of taxes, Chester.....	600
The receiverships of taxes are mostly given to the thick and thin supporters of the system. Trafford is, if we mistake not, the magistrate, who, in conjunction with Parson Hay, who immediately after received the valuable living of Rochdale from the late Archbishop Sutton, directed the memorable outrage of Manchester in the year 1819.	

Trail, rev. Anthony, pension on Irish civil list, 1794.....	£132
Trail, Clarissa, pension on Irish civil list, 1809	356
Treasure, Elizabeth, widow, pension on civil list, 1820	100
Trefusis, hon. C. R. commissioner of excise	1400
Trevor, C. solicitor of legacy duties	600
Trimlestown, baroness dowager, pension on English c. l. 1811	125
Pension on Irish civil list, 1823.....	26
Mother to the late general Eustace, and wife of general Lloyd, late of the 17th lancers, who was long in India.	
Trower, J. master in chancery, for year ending Jan. 5, 1830	3340
Troy, J. J. collector of customs, Limerick.....	500
Turner, R. deputy surveyor of New Forest, 1815	350
Allowance for Parkhurst Forest	50
Turner, sir H. governor of Bermuda	3035
Turner, W. envoy extraordinary in Colombia	5074
Turton, sir Thomas, clerk of juries, common pleas	96
Turton, W. one of the six clerks in chancery.....	1217
Twysden, sir W. J. receiver-general of taxes, Kent	600
Tyrconnel, earl of, pension on English civil list, 1813	600
Pension on Irish civil list, 1813.....	445
His brother, the late lord, was in the army, and shiprecked in the Baltic returning from St. Petersburg with despatches. Why this lord has got two pensions ought to be explained.	
Tyndale, W. pension on civil list, 1820	200
Tyton, A. retired allowance as <i>late solicitor to the customs</i> ..	1800
Pretty well this for a retired solicitor, whose salary and emoluments had averaged, perhaps, £3000 or £4000 per annum. All the government solicitors and assistant solicitors would bear considerable reduction. The solicitor of the treasury has returned his emoluments at £2800 a year, of customs £2500, of excise £2500, of stamps £1200, and of assessed taxes £1500.	
Unwin, John, senior clerk in the Treasury.....	1000
Ure, James, comptroller of customs, Leith.....	540
Utterson, E. V. one of six clerks in chancery.....	1217
As the name implies there are six of these officers enjoying incomes of £1200 a year; they are sinecurists and their offices might be abolished without detriment to the public. They have so little duty that the custom of these gentlemen is to divide the year into six portions of two months each, and the attendance of one of them at a time is deemed sufficient. Can any one be surprised at the expense of proceedings in chancery, when there is a judge with £12,000 a year, sinecures worth £10,000 per annum, registrars with £5000 income, masters £4000, and clerks with average incomes of £1200 and £1400 a year—and all these great emoluments, or nearly so, accruing from fees levied on the unfortunate suitor—widow, orphan, lunatic, or bankrupt? We say nothing of the fleecings he undergoes in the <i>honorariums</i> , refreshers, consultations, and half-guinea “motions of course,” paid to counsel; nor of the term-fees, six and eight-penny touches, copy charges, and court attendancies of solicitors.	
Usher, Alicia, Frances, Margaret, and Sarah, pension on civil list, 1827	100
Udney, Martha, pension on civil list, 1816	445

Van Spiegle, A. senior clerk in treasury	£1008
Van de Spiegle, Adolph, pension on civil list, 1801	60
Van de Spiegle, Maria, pension on civil list, 1801	68
Vallancey, Catharine, pension on Irish civil list, 1790	132
Vallancey, Frances and Mary, pension on Irish c. l. 1770, each	88
Vallancey, Isabella, pension on Irish civil list, 1823	61
Vallancey, Fanny, pension on Irish civil list, 1820	42
Valle, P. H. sub-clerk privy council office	653
Vandeleur, lieut.-gen. sir J. O. col. 14th light dragoons	1501
Pension for wounds	350
Vandeleur, T. B. fourth justice of the king's bench, Ireland..	3692
Vanderkiste, F. W. comptroller of customs, Cork	600
Vaughan, C. R. envoy and minister plenipo. at Washington..	6000
Vaughan, sir J. baron of the court of exchequer	5516
Venables, J. junior clerk in home department, 1803	612
Private secretary in home department, 1823	300
Receiver of the eight police offices, 1822	500
Receiver of tenths, 1827	300
Verbeke, J. F. deputy commissary general, half-pay, 1815 ..	267
Consul of the Netherlands	600
Vernon, sir Charles, pension on civil list, 1823	266
Vernon, Harriet, Caroline, and Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1763, each	88
A sight of these spinsters would needs be gratifying to admirers of the antique!	
Vernon, Joseph, receiver of fees in the treasury	700
Vesey, Francis, commissioner of bankrupts, 1807	350
One of six clerks in chancery, 1811	1200
Villiers, G. W. F. commissioner of customs	1400
Vivian, major-gen sir R. H. M.P. for Windsor; col. 12th light dragoons, staff and regimental pay and emoluments	2225
Pension for wounds	350
Equerry to the king	750
Wade, Mary, pension on Irish civil list, 1829	100
Wadman, J. first under clerk teller's office	800
Walpole, Edward, clerk in the treasury and private secretary to chancellor of exchequer	900
For making out East India accounts	300
Walpole, F. junior clerk in home department, 1811	506
Joint distributor of military commissions, 1817	76
Allowance for yeomanry correspondence, 1820	100
Walsingham, lord, and de Grey, Thomas, pension on c. l. 1794	938
Walton, F. clerk foreign department, post-office	580
Walker, J. K. cocket writer, customs	1051
Walker, Thomas, police justice, Lambeth Street	800
Ward, R. P. auditor of the civil list	1400
Late clerk in ordnance	500

Ward, John, inspector of aliens at Dover, 1825	£100
Collector of customs, Dover	700
Ward, E. M. minister plenipotentiary at Dresden	2601
Warde, lieut.-gen. sir H. colonel 68th foot	1170
Wardlow, sir W. pension on Scotch civil list, 1824	72
Warrington, H. consul-general, Tripoli	1800
Walford, J. G. solicitor to the board of customs	2500
Warner, A. chief judge, Trinidad	1075
Warren, C. W. clerk first class in the war-office	661
Warren, Mary, Sarah, Anne, and Rebecca, pension on Irish civil list, 1787, each	43
Wallace, J. collector of customs, Waterford	700
Walbeoff, J. superintendent of cinnamon plantations	1688
Watson, sir F. B. master of his majesty's household	1158
Pension on civil list, 1827	931
Waters, John, clerk to chief justice of court of king's bench; from fees	2169
To fees are often added the corruptive agency of gratuities, so that when an income arises from the former it is hardly possible to fix the amount; depending, too, a good deal on the cupidity or liberality of the fee-gatherer. We wonder who this Mr. Waters can be, and what can be the grave and responsible nature of his duties to entitle him to tax the king's lieges, suing for justice in the highest court, to the tune of £2169 per annum.	
Watson, T. clerk to clerk of the rates, customs, salary	3114
Watts, R. clerk of a road, general post office	1331
Late clerk in tax-office	400
Watts, E. consul at Carthage	2100
Webb, W. deputy commissary-general, half-pay, 1822	267
Commissioner for valuation of houses, Dublin	560
Wedderburne, sir D. deputy postmaster-general, Edinburgh ..	800
Wellington, Charlotte, pension on civil list, 1800	115
Wellington, duke of, pensions out of consolidated fund	8926
Constable of the tower	950
Colonel of rifle brigade	238
Colonel of 1st regiment of foot guards	2695
Lord warden of Cinque ports	295

Our readers may have observed in the course of this work and previous to the fall of the Duke, that we dropped several laudatory expressions in his favour. The fact is we were pleased with the energy with which he had carried through the beer bill, the catholic relief bill, and the bill for the abrogation of the test acts, and we firmly believed him to be, if not a foe to a *job* in his own person, or that of his friends and family, a determined foe to jobs in others. Hence our *gratitude*; we flattered ourselves the Duke might prove a judicious and patriotic statesman, as he had shown himself a successful military commander. All our hopes have been grievously disappointed, and after the demonstrations made by the prince of Waterloo of his capacity and views, since the meeting of parliament, we have no hesitation in ranking him among the most incapable of ministers and the greatest enemies of our country and mankind.

In his foreign policy the Duke is the steadfast partizan of the Holy Alliance ; in his domestic policy he belongs to the Tory faction ; that besotted crew of plunderers, possessed of neither common sense nor common honesty, and whose demon ascendancy of forty years has entailed on the empire all its calamities. Agreeably with the views of this party the Premier had prepared to open the parliamentary campaign. Retrenchment was to proceed no further ; the principle of free-trade was not to be persisted in ; judicial, ecclesiastical, and above all, parliamentary reform, and every thing new or novel was to be repudiated and discountenanced. Abroad the continental system was to be upheld—the vile treaties of 1815 maintained inviolate—and after a million of bayonets had been silently assembled on the Rhine, the Moselle, and the Adige, the kingdom of the Netherlands forcibly re-established, and the liberties of Frenchmen subverted by another victory of Waterloo. Such was the train of mischief laid by the Field Marshal ! one hundred millions more were to be added to the Debt—the dead weight doubled—and Europe deluged with blood that half-a-dozen crowned conspirators might be guaranteed in their usurpations over the rights and liberties of the human race.

And what averted these calamities ? It was the spirit of the People acting on the fears of parliament. Such was the deep and universal feeling of indignation excited by the royal speech and the declarations of the Duke, that we are not sure both monarchy and aristocracy would have been laid in the dust had not the premier made a timely retreat. Perhaps his abdication was not the most favourable issue : had the Captain been allowed to follow up his mad resolves, it is certain from the pervading spirit of the continent, Germany, Italy, and Prussia, would have been free by the discomfiture of their tyrants in open battle ; but the day is not far distant, when that emancipation will be effected by reason and example, which the insane arrogance of despotism failed to accomplish.

It is astonishing how the Duke could hit on such a mistaken course of policy. Would none of the parasites, pensioned dowagers, and demireps, who haunt his steps open his eyes ? Even sir R. Peel might have told him England is not in the state it was in 1793—that there has been a complete revolution in public sentiment—that an individual is hardly to be found who is not convinced of the blunders, profligacy, and mis-government of the last half-century—and that all classes—rich and poor—are either dismayed by the overwhelming embarrassments of the system and quiescent in its defence ; or the open and determined partizans of its thorough reform. Under such altered circumstances what a brainless project to think of reviving the Pitt system—resorting to Algerine acts—appealing to persons of property—and coercing the entire population, the most favourably disposed portion of which is resolved to be *neutral*, and all the rest in fierce and determined opposition.

It is hardly worth while inquiring now how far the Duke participated in the plans of the miserable Polignac. The wretched outcasts would not have sought refuge here had they not been previously apprised of the *spirit* of those who presided over the public councils. Subsequently the ex-premier has been pleased to designate the glorious *three days* a “bad example,”—an opinion, no doubt, he shares in common with prince Metternich, and the autocrat of Russia. France had not much to gain by her immortal triumph ; she had only to defend, not to conquer free institutions. Her first revolution had swept away an oppressive tithe system, a privileged noblesse, a feudal game-code, and a plundering and barbarous judicial adminis-

tration. Would to God our revolution of 1688 had done as much for us, and then we should not have had still to struggle through the Augean stable of aristocratical, legal and ecclesiastical abuse!

We shall leave the Duke with a fervent prayer that he will never again be premier of England. His ideas and sentiments are wholly alien to the happiness and liberties of Englishmen, and we verily believe his return to power would be the signal for a general rising throughout the United Kingdom.

Wellesley, marquis, pension from the East-India company . . .	£5000
Lord steward of the household	1540
Late joint chief remembrancer of court of exchequer, Ireland	5387

The Wellesleys derive a greater revenue from the taxes than any other aristocratical family. But how can we complain of the income of the duke, or of his brother, both eminent for their services; while there is a prince Leopold with £50,000 a year, bishops with £30,000, and a patentee of bankrupts with £10,000 per annum? The following piece of information appeared in the *Limerick Chronicle*:—"The marquis W. late viceroy of Ireland, has *seventy-two* sons, all provided for by the public." The "Hero of the East," as the conqueror of Tippoo Saib used to be styled, has certainly been viceroy of Ireland, but the intelligence cannot refer to him; for though his lordship has been twice married, he has no issue by either union. It is, we know, a very general complaint that scarcely any person without family influence and born in lawful wedlock, can obtain a situation in the public offices, owing to the numerous illegitimate progeny of the "higher orders," claiming to be provided for.

Welfit, W. commissioner of bankrupts, 1801	350
Cursitor of court of chancery, 1814	560
West, Robert B. clerk dead letter office, Ireland, 1800	184
Taxing clerk inland-office, Ireland, 1800	184
West, F. N. escrivans to the court, Trinidad	1821
Weston, W. surveyor-general, customs	800
Weston, J. C. cocket-writer, customs	1868
Westmeath, marchioness of, lady of the Queen's bed-chamber Pension on Irish civil list, 1829	105 386

It would puzzle any one, unless it were the duke of Wellington, to explain the nature of the services by which the marchioness of Westmeath has become entitled to £386 a year, out of the taxes. All the public knows of the lady is that she is sister to the marquis of Salisbury, who has large estates; that she has for many years been on bad terms with her husband, that they have parted several times and again lived together, and not long since the marquis instituted a suit in Doctors' Commons for the *restitution of conjugal rights*! Her ladyship, it appears, has obtained an appointment near the person of the queen, which we take to be a way-lay of the field marshal, that concerns the Whigs more than any body else: we verily believe no man knows better than the duke how to post his troops—take up a position—throw up entrenchments—and prepare for defensive or offensive warfare; and we never knew the captain to be out-generalled in these matters, except last summer, when at the tent-scene in Kensington Gardens he was fairly put out of countenance in the presence of royalty, and had very much the appearance of a camp flagstaff beside the nodding plume and glitter-

ing helmet of lord Combermere.—N.B. The marquis of Anglesey refused to sign this pension, and returned it to the duke of Wellington; when Geo. IV. sent an autograph order to the marquis to grant this pension to the lady, on the Irish establishment.	
West, G. clerk in treasury, and for making special payments	£ 1100
Weir, Dr. John, commissioner, victualling-office	1000
Wharton, Henrietta, pension on civil list, 1813	501
Is this the widow of the former chairman of the house of commons? or of the member for Beverley? A job in either case.	
Whitelow, Elinor, pension on Irish civil list, 1813	177
Whitelocke, George, pension on Irish civil list, 1765	177
A poor woman was recently convicted in the Metropolis for defrauding the parish, in having continued to receive the allowance for the maintenance of a natural child after its death. We suspect similar cajollery among the state paupers. It is hardly likely so many pensioners should be alive whose grants are dated sixty or seventy years back; dead-weight and annuity people, we know, are proverbially tenacious of vitality, still we trust lord Althorp will make inquiry and not suffer to be added to our other grievances in this matter, the vexation of being imposed upon by absolute counterfeits.	
White, W. D. clerk in the office of woods and forests, 1810..	450
Receiver of crown rents in London and Middlesex, 1827	500
Whitmore, T. secretary to the board of customs	1700
Whitmore, col. G. royal engineers, Malta	1195
Whittingham, Maria, pension on civil list, 1822	400
Is this the wife of general Whittingham, who is on the staff in India? If so, too bad.	
Whishaw, J. commissioner of audit	1200
Wilmot, Sarah Ann Eardly, widow, pension on civil list, 1797	311
Wickham, rt. hon. W. late minister to Swiss Cantons	1200
Wickham, Eleanor, pension on civil list, 1803	526
Wilson, sir George, master in chancery for year 1830	3273
Wilson, W. principal clerk army-pay-office	600
Wilson, Dr. Isaac, physician to Haslar-hospital	600
Wilson, Ann, children of, pension on civil list, 1797	276
Wilson, G. allowance as late commissioner of customs	1050
Wilson, R. commissioner of bankrupts, 1802	350
Cursitor for London and Middlesex, 1823	1176
Wilson, major-gen. W. col. commandant 14th royal artillery	1003
Wilson, sir Robert, M.P. for Southwark, and lieut.-general in the army	no return

Most people are much astonished what the plain and sensible Boroughnians can have to do with such a dangler at the Pavilion as their present representative. It is very many years since sir Robert either did or said any thing worth remembering; and after the restoration of his military rank, he has become quite a courtier, apparently with a much stronger aptitude for a *gold stick* or *groomship* of the bedchamber, than the legislative duties of a commercial population. On the important question of the civil list, the cunning fox neither acted "like an honest man nor a soldier;" for though in the house before and after the division, he adroitly kept aloof

from voting, dexterously presenting two faces, one to Windsor and another to Brookes's. Sir Robert has expressed himself favourable to a property-tax; but avast there, good knight; let us first see what can be done by a reduction in salaries, pensions, sinecures, and the royal household. On the subject of the ballot, the M.P. for Southwark has made himself conspicuous; here, again, we see the craftiness of the old campaigner. It is obvious, an extension of the elective franchise, without the protection of the ballot, would aggravate, in lieu of reforming, the evils of the existing system. "Ah, but," says the commander of the Lusitanian legion, "that is a *novelty*; and I was born under a monarchy, and am resolved, with the noble and learned lord in the other place, to perish in its ruins." Bravo, general! be it so; only let us have cheap, intelligent, and protective institutions, and we shall not care a straw whether it be monarchy, republic, triumvirate, or consulate.

Wilkin, John, receiver of crown rents in Wales, 1819	£439
Late receiver of duties on offices and pensions, 1811..	395
Wilkinson, Robert, clerk in war-office, 1802.....	620
Compiler of army lists, 1808	231
Joint collector of fees on military commissions, 1808..	95
Wilkinson, E. clerk of the affidavits, customs	2199
Willis, John, pension on civil list, 1791.....	509
Wilkins, Eliza, pension on civil list, 1800.....	115
Wilcox, Elizabeth, pension on civil list, 1821	100
Williamson, D. lord of session, Scotland	2000
Williamson, John S. col. royal artillery, 1825	474
Superintendent of royal military repository, 1828	200
Allowance for one servant	27
Williams, C. northern clerk in the secretary's office, customs	800
Comptroller of the housekeeper's accounts	50
Williams, John, M.P. for Winchelsea; queen's attorney-gen.	no return
Williams, R. J. clerk to receiver of custom duties, outwards ..	1182
Williams, rev. J. P. rector of St. Elizabeth, Jamaica	1157
Williams, J. receiver of taxes, Wales	600
Willimott, R. distributor of stamps, excise	1000
Receiver-general post-office	800
Willimott, W. receiver of wine and plantation duties, customs	1436
Willimott, T. S. vice consul and pro consul at Lima.....	1150
Willimott, T. collector of customs	2400
Willimott, Mary, pension on civil list, 1827	100
Willoughby, Harriet, pension on civil list, 1806	276
Willoughby, T. E. registrar-general of shipping.....	500
Wilde, sir J. chief justice, Cape of Good Hope	2500
Wingfield, W. master in chancery for year ending Jan. 5, 1830	4161

The masterships are mostly the reward of political subserviency, or bestowed on the personal friends of the lord chancellor. The duties of the masters are to receive affidavits, and examine accounts, and other matters referred to them by the equity judges; they are also the messengers of the house of lords, in communicating with the commons; and the further useless service is imposed upon them of attending every morning the lord chancellor and master of the

rolls, for no other apparent purpose than parade. Some of the duties of these officers are of the first importance, but like every thing else in chancery, are discharged in the worst possible manner for the convenience of suitors. In the reign of Charles II. the masters sat from seven in the morning till twelve, and again from two till six in the afternoon; being nine hours each day. In 1816 they sat from ten to three, and from six to eight, being seven hours; but at present the average time is less than five hours a day. As the hours of attendance have decreased, in similar inverse proportion the emoluments have increased. In 1798, the average, for fifteen years preceding, gave to the masters a salary of £1615 to the highest, and to the lowest £976. The average of the following nineteen years gave to the highest paid master £1914, and to the smaller ones £1060. The average at present is from £3800 to £4500 per annum. Their chief clerks have undergone corresponding increase in remuneration, and realize about £1400 per annum. It would be quite impossible to notice here the manifold abuses in the masters' offices; an obvious mode of reform would be, to render their sittings public. One grievance is so oppressive on suitors, that we cannot help noticing it. The practice is to issue hourly warrants; in consequence of which the parties are put to the expense of paying counsel and attorneys for attending hourly to no purpose. Thus, suppose the master has four cases to hear, he appoints four separate hours, each hour to be appropriated to a case, which, if unfinished, is postponed to a future day; and this, though it is previously known that any one of the cases would occupy the whole four hours.

Wittwer, T. N. allowance as late accountant to India Board..	£1150
Accountant between public and E. I. Company	300
Wiseman, Harriet, pension on civil list, 1825	100
Winning, Henrietta, pension on civil list, 1808	233
Winchester, marquis of, groom of the stole	2130

Here is another of those courtly offices, which ought to be abolished, augmenting unnecessarily the expenditure of the civil list. It is not sufficient to say these costly appendages are essential to support the royal dignity. The dignity of the crown is a senseless sound, unless tending to increase the respect and veneration of the people; but mere pageantry, in an enlightened age, can have no such effect: it only revolts the mind from an institution, obviously maintained in useless state, by a sacrifice of the general welfare. Impoverished by aristocratic wars and misgovernment, we are disabled, if otherwise inclined, from supporting the gewgaws of royalty; and the less we have of them, the more estimable the kingly offices will appear in popular estimation. Milton says, "the very trappings of monarchy cost more than the whole establishment of the most costly republics." The nearer we approximate regality to the simplicity of republican institutions, the more permanent and commanding will be its influence. We would neither deprive royalty, nor any public office, of due respect, but we would abridge every useless expenditure, which only promotes the corruption of politicians and courtiers. To what public purport, or private gratification of the king, are the offices of groom of the stole, master of the hawks, master of the buck-hounds, master of the horse, or grooms and lords of the bedchamber? These are menial offices, and unbecoming the dignity of noblemen, if endowed with the genuine feelings of nobility. At best, they serve only to purchase the support of some needy boroughmonger, or provide for some low parasite, or ruined aristocrat.

Wood, major-gen. sir G. major-general, unattached	£590
Pension for services	456
Wood, R. R. clerk, secretary of state's office	935
Naval officer, Grenada	200
Late vendu-master, Malta	904
Woodford, C. senior clerk in the treasury	1000
Woolley, capt. Isaac, deputy chairman, victualling office	1000
Pension for wounds	250
Worthington, T. surveyor-general, customs	800
Wray, Charles, president and judge, vice admiralty, Demerara	3500
Wray, John, receiver of new metropolitan police establishment	700
Wraxall, Jane, pension on civil list, 1793	311
Wright, Alexander, Alfred, and Caroline, pension, each, on civil list, 1827	25
Wright, Thomas, collector of customs, Plymouth	500
Wulbier, W. R. minute clerk, audit-office	450
Pension for special services	150
Clerk for paying fees on passing accounts, 1815	150
Wulff, major-gen. G. col. commandant royal artillery	1003
Wyndham, hon. P. C. secretary of council, remembrancer of court of exchequer, and clerk of common pleas, Barbadoes	1476
Wyndham, hon. P. C. registrar in chancery, and clerk of the patents, Jamaica	4050
The duties of the hon. Percy-Charles Wyndham, brother of lord Egremont, are discharged by <i>deputy</i> ; the emoluments are principally paid by the inhabitants of the islands, who are twitched up for <i>judicial fees</i> in the same fleecing manner that suitors for justice are in the courts of the United Kingdom.	
Wylde, John, pension on Scotch civil list, 1796	138
Wynford, lord, late chief justice common pleas	3750
Wynne, Robert, pension on Irish civil list, 1805	443
Wynne, W. commissioner of appeals, Ireland	738
Commissioner of inquiry, ditto	1200
Wynn, H. W. W. envoy and min. plenipo. at Copenhagen ..	4900
Wynne, rt. hon. W. W. secretary at war	2480
Wynyard, gen. H. col. 46th foot, pay	613
Wynyard, lady, pension on civil list, 1819	467
Wyon, Thomas, chief engraver, mint-office	500
Yates, Jane, pension on Irish civil list, 1814	61
Ditto, Mary, pension on civil list, 1794	177
Yonge, dame, pension on English civil list, 1812	300
Ditto, pension on Irish civil list, 1804	445
There was a sir George Yonge of old in the war-office, but from the date of the pension she cannot well be his widow.	
Young, J. W. protector of slaves, Demerara	2000
Yorke, right hon. teller of the exchequer (<i>sinecure</i>)	2700
Zachary, M. cocket writer, customs	1698

To a few of the preceding names we subjoin notes, omitted at the commencement of the *Place and Pension List*, and which have been chiefly supplied by "RADICAL," a valuable correspondent of *The Times*.

Allen, viscount.—Could not this noble lord pay his subscriptions at White's, Brookes's and Crockford's—his journey to and from Paris, and his cabriolet, without the paltry pension attached to his name?

Arbuthnot, Harriet.—The wife of a veteran placeman, and the pension to his lady is to undergo parliamentary inquiry, which promises some amusement.

Baker, lady Elizabeth.—Sister to the duke of Leinster, and widow of an under secretary of state.

Baker, sir Robert.—Late Bow-street magistrate, dismissed and pensioned after queen Caroline's funeral. If he neglected his duty, he ought not to have got a pension.

Blackwood, sir H.—Commanded a frigate at Trafalgar; but other captains in that action have neither obtained a place at court nor a pension.

Blacquire, sir John and lord de.—The same person who, with a handsome person and good address, succeeded well at the vice-regal court, and was well known in both parliaments.

Bowles, Charles.—But for the spirit of plunder that is afloat, would this gentleman as a retired private secretary to Mr. Goulburn, when secretary for Ireland, be pleased to receive for himself and his wife, one of the Montague's of Portman-square, £192. Mr. Bowles, who married the sister of Mrs. Goulburn, found it both pleasant and convenient to shut up, or let his own house in Berkshire, and to go over to Ireland to spend his time in the Phoenix-park with his brother-in-law, and being dubbed private secretary, is fixed on poor Ireland as an annual charge, on bidding her adieu, the slight-of-hand politics of the day unaccountably advancing his kind protector and guardian to the dignity of chancellor of the exchequer.

Clare, lady, and her daughter.—The former, widow of an Irish lord chancellor, who was long in office, realized money, purchased estates, and ought to have been in good circumstances. It was he who was said to have alarmed George III.'s conscience as to the coronation oath; and, if so, was really the cause of retarding the catholic claims thirty years, and for which we are now suffering. The present lord is governor of Bombay.

Cockburn, dame Augusta.—Probably the mother of sir James, sir George, the dean of York, and the Colombian or Mexican ambassador. She was of a noble family, and fell in love with her husband, who was either a merchant, or held an office in the India-house. To reconcile her marriage with this person to her family he was made a baronet. How the other members of the family have been provided for will be seen on reference to the *List*.

Coke, Elizabeth Ann.—This certainly cannot be the lady of the member for Norfolk, and lessee of Dungeness lighthouse?

Congreve, dame Isabella.—The widow of the gentleman of *share-notoriety*, who was himself a pensioner, and at one time much about the person of George IV.

Crofton, hon. Caroline.—Her father a man of large fortune, and her mother created a peeress in her own right; sister to Mr. St. George, and aunt of present lord Crofton.

D'Este, colonel and miss.—Children of the duke of Sussex, by his marriage with lady Augusta Murray, (D'Ameland, see page 139,) but which was set aside by the severity of our feudal laws. The royal marriage act is one of great cruelty; but if our princes form attachments, they should take care to make provision for their offspring from the handsome allowances they receive, and should not seek to quarter them on the public: we expected better from the high mindedness of his highness of Sussex.

Eden, Emily and Frances.—Sisters of lord Auckland, himself a pensioner and a minister.

Erskine, lady Louisa and Louisa.—Both one person, we believe, and if both

pensions continue to be received, it is most extraordinary. The lady is the daughter of the old lord Uxbridge, and married a colonel Erskine who died pending proceedings instituted for a divorce. She has since married sir George Murray, the late colonial secretary, who appears from our *List* to have large military emoluments (also, perhaps, a retiring pension), and who can hardly sanction his wife drawing a pension as the widow of the late sir James Erskine.

Fitzhum, madame.—The pension granted during his viceroyship, by marquis Wellesley, who can, perhaps, explain it, as well as that to lady Montgomery, and other followers to the Emerald Isle.

Fox, Anne.—A natural daughter, we fear, of Charles James Fox, and who, if need be, ought to have been provided for by the Fox club.

Graham, Misses.—These ladies' father was a man of large fortune, of Fintray, but who dissipated it, and are near relatives of lord Lynedoch. But every one relieves himself to burthen the public. This proves the great necessity that there should be no pension list. In no other country are the poor and decayed relations of the privileged classes so provided for as in England.

Johnston, sir W.—An old bachelor of large property at Gilford, county Downe; well-known at Bath and other watering places, being altogether an absentee.

Knoxes.—Younger children of lord Northland, who holds large sinecure places, besides possessing large estates.

Laffan, sir J. de.—Went to Ireland as physician to the marquis of Anglesey, having been first made a baronet; and who granted the pension about the time, it is said, he refused to sign the pension of the marchioness of Westmeath.

Mountjoy, lord, representatives of.—That the representatives of this nobleman should have had any pension, is unaccountable. He had large estates, which descended to his only son, and he left his three daughters large fortunes.

Muskerry, baroness.—Widow of a brave officer, whose father's profligacy left penniless.

Palmer, lady.—Sister to the duke of Gordon, and wife, by second marriage, to the popular member for Reading.

Rumbold, Emily.—Sister to sir William, who was taken out to India by the marquis of Hastings, and has married a wealthy Prussian jew, of the name of Delmar; yet she still continues on the *List*, but this lady may follow the fashion, and pay it over to her sister Miss Caroline Eliza, who has not been so fortunate.

Sewell, hon. Harriet.—One of the Beresford family, daughter of the late archbishop of Tuam, sister to present lord Decies, and to Mrs. Thomas Hope of the gay world.

Stratton, lady Emily.—Another sister of the duke of Leinster. Her husband had a large fortune, and got through it all in a few years.

A copious introduction to the Place and Pension List renders unnecessary many observations at the conclusion. We might have multiplied notes, but we made a point of passing over the Grenvilles, Sidmouths, and other individuals already sufficiently known, whose *merits* have been canvassed and long since settled in public estimation. Many *names* illustrate themselves, others by juxta-position; and really we cannot help thinking that our alphabetic arrangement has enabled us to perform a task very usual at the Christmas season—that of assembling families together—from the royal household, the colonies, courts of law, army, navy, and public-offices, exhibiting them face to face, their incomes, emoluments, connexions, and prospects.

Our *List* has one advantage over any other previously given to the public. All the individuals enrolled upon it are *living*, or were living within a few months of the period of publication. From it the public will be able to learn who receive exorbitant emoluments, and the amount of them in every branch of the public service—civil, judicial, naval, and military.

With respect to the pensioners, they are, we apprehend, a nuisance which will be shortly abated. There may be some deserving objects, but they are only a grain of sand on the sea-shore,—the mass are too vile for description, and their plunderings will be no longer tolerated. We are told, indeed, “to pause before we plunge *noble* families into distress.” But in the words of a contemporary we say, “If noble families are to keep their nobility only by living on the public, perish their nobility.” Surely tithes and corn-laws are sufficient for the maintenance of the “order,” or, if they be still indigent, let them appear in their proper character, and not assume to rank above other paupers. What claim have the Mulgraves, the Manchesters, the Arbuthnots, the Grevilles, the Morningsons, and the Bathursts; or the lady Anns, Emilys, Bettys, and Jennies, of any titled beggar, to the money wrung from the labours and necessities of the industrious and now deeply depressed people. If they think carriages and fine clothes, titles and fine houses, essential to their existence, let them pay for them out of their own purses; if they cannot pay for them, what right have they to them? or what right have they to make the people pay for them? The whole affair is a gross insult to common sense; and those silken creatures, and their dandy brothers, ethereal and exquisite as they may be, must do like others, earn their bread by honest industry or have no bread to eat. Noble families have long been under a delusion and seem to think they have a hereditary right to be fed and clothed at the public expense, whatever be their improvidence, folly, or worthlessness; but they must be undeceived:—no more lordly plunderings by the sons and daughters of corruption, if they cannot support themselves by useful services, they must descend from their fictitious rank and learn the duties of their proper station in society. They will gain a great deal by the change, lose nothing in point of real dignity, or perhaps comfort; for there can be no dignity not founded in justice, nor comfort, in enjoying the rewards which no desert has acquired.

P.S.—The duchess dowager of Newcastle has signified to the Treasury her wish that her name should no longer appear on the *Court Pension List*. Will the duke of Wellington follow so good an example? The known tenacity of his grace of a *good position* forbids the hope, and we fear the duke will not draw in any even of his piquets, neither the Mornington, the Ann Culling Smith, the Westmeath, the Hill, and his ex-private secretaries.

APPENDIX.

LIST

OF THE

BISHOPS, DIGNITARIES, AND PLURALISTS

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

EXPLANATIONS.

THE name of the Pluralist comes first. After the name comes the first living of the Pluralist in *italic*, and an initial letter denoting its title—namely, *r.* for rectory, *v.* for vicarage, *c.* for chapelry, *p.c.* for perpetual curacy, and *d.* for donative. The name of the Patron is put after the living or livings, supposing more than one living, of which the same person is patron. *Abp.* is put for archbishop, *bp.* for bishop, *archd.* for archdeacon, *dn.* for dean, *ch.* for chapter. When a living is in the gift of the University of Oxford, *Oxon* is put; when of the University of Cambridge, *Camb.* When a *nobleman*, as the duke of Newcastle, or the marquis of Exeter, is patron, the *of* in the title is omitted both for brevity and propriety. The “*of*” expresses territorial jurisdiction, but as they do not possess such authority at the present day, the term by which it is implied may be properly dropped.

In the language of churchmen a living or benefice, which are synonymous, is a *rectory* or *vicarage* only; but many chapelries are equally entitled to fall under this denomination, and have been so considered. There are free chapels perpetually maintained, and provided with a minister, without charge to the rector or parish. In some places chapels of ease are endowed with lands and tithes; they have by custom a right to a distinct minister, to baptize, to administer sacraments and burial: such parochial chapelries differ only in name from parish churches. *Parish* is a vague term. In the north, parishes comprise 30 or 40 square miles, which is seven or eight times the area of parishes in the south. Under 13th Charles II. certain townships and villages are allowed to maintain their own poor; hence these townships become so many distinct parishes. There are 200 *extra-parochial* places, many of which are as large as parishes; these are exempt from poor-rate, because there is no overseer on

whom the magistrate can serve an order;—from militia, because no constable to make a return;—from repairing highways, because no surveyor. The 37 Hen. VIII. c. 31, (also 4 and 5 Will. & Mary,) allows the union of churches, when not more than *one mile* apart, and under value of £6. Under these acts churches have been united; the city of London reckons 108 parishes, forming no more than 78 benefices; in Norwich, 70 parishes have been compressed into 37 benefices. Contrary to the rule of ecclesiastics, we have considered all parishes held *cum*, or with another distinct benefices; the only reasons for an opposite course is, that they form only one presentation, though such presentation is often held by *two* patrons, who present alternately; and many of such consolidated parishes (Upham *cum* Durley, for instance,) have two churches, and two sets of overseers and churchwardens.

Apart, then, from the corruptions and mystification of the Church, we have deemed every parochial preferment, chapelry, vicarage, or rectory, a *living*; and we consider every clergyman a *pluralist* who holds two such preferments, whether separate or united. A *curacy*, without any great impropriety, might be styled a living, as a stipend is, or ought to be, annexed to the office, adequate to the maintenance of at least one individual: but as curates are removable at the pleasure of incumbents, they are excluded from our *List*, which includes only beneficed clergymen.

The abuse of holding *two* livings or more is so prevalent, that to have enumerated all the transgressors (about 2880 in number,) would have extended our *List* to an inconvenient length, without corresponding utility; our object has been to exhibit the more flagrant breaches of ecclesiastical discipline; and with this view, we have restricted ourselves to such shameful monopolists among the parochial clergy as hold *three or more* preferments. We have also included the bishops and principal dignitaries of the church.

The 21 Hen. VIII. c. 13, prohibits a person holding a second benefice when the first is worth *eight pounds* in the King's Book. But a man, by dispensation, may hold as many benefices, without cure, as he can get; and, likewise, so many with cure as he can get, all of them, or all but the last, being under the value of eight pounds; provided the person to be dispensed withal be not otherwise incapable thereof. By the 41st canon, however, of 1603, the two benefices must not be farther distant than *thirty miles*; and persons obtaining dispensation, must at least be M.A. But the provisions of this canon are not regarded or enforced in the courts of law; and the privileges, *ex officio*, entitling to grants of dispensation, are so numerous, and the facilities for obtaining them, through favour or evasion, so easy, that there can hardly be said to exist a practical check to the most aggravated cases of plurality.

In the disposal of every living, three parties are principally concerned: *first*, the patron; *second*, the incumbent; *third*, the bishop. The patron is the person in whom the right of presenting to a living is vested. The person nominated by the patron is the incumbent. The right of presentation to a living is called an *advowson*. The office of the bishop is to grant institution to the living to which the incumbent is presented. By refusing institution, the bishops have a veto on appointments by patrons: this veto, however, is rarely exercised, and it is seldom that the patron and the diocesan are at issue. The most important personage in the affair is the patron. It will be seen from the *List* that the patronage is sometimes in individuals—sometimes in public bodies. Sometimes the incumbent is his *own* patron, and presents himself; sometimes the incumbent's wife is patron, and presents her husband; sometimes the husband and wife are co-patrons. In some instances the patronage is divided, the nomination being in one party and the appointment in another. Many *ladies* are patrons, and though otherwise ineligible to the exercise of civil rights, no doubt well qualified to select spiritual persons for the cure of souls.

Nearly all the livings in the metropolis, and the most valuable livings in the large towns in the country, are in the gift of the crown, which adds enormously to its influence. The patronage not in the crown is chiefly in the aristocracy, the universities, and the bishops. The patronage of the aristocracy is chiefly bestowed on the "honourable lumber" of their own families: the patronage of

the universities on the members of those places; the patronage of the bishops on their connexions and relations to the hundredth degree. A great mass of patronage, however, remains, which cannot be disposed of in any of these ways; for though the families of the Aristocracy have been recently proved to be, on the average, more prolific than those of the Democracy, they are not sufficiently so to fill all offices in the army, navy, law, church, and public departments; and consequently, there is a surplus patronage to be brought into the market, which is disposed of, like other commodities, to the highest bidder.

It would have been more satisfactory, had we been able to state the *present* value of livings; but there is no authentic data for the purpose: parliamentary returns, it is true, have been made of the *poor* livings, but none of the *rich* ones; and there have been returns of the *number* of all livings above and below the value of £300, having non-resident incumbents;* returns, also, have been ordered this session of the value of livings in the gift of the crown: this is something; but what the public wants is the separate value of every benefice, dignity, and ecclesiastical preferment, and the *proportion* in which, and number of individuals among whom they are shared. By such data would be shown what the church of England really is, and indisputably prove the existence of those enormous abuses, which, at the commencement of this work, we have fully proved to pervade the ecclesiastical establishment.

- Adams, J. C. *Saxleby*, r. earl Aylesford. *Shilfon*, c. *Anstye*, c. the King.
- Affleck, R. preb. of York; *Silkston*, r. with *Bretton*, *Monk*, and *Stainborough chapelries*. abp. of York. *Tresswell*, *East Mediety*, r. *West Mediety*, r. dn. and ch. of York and Mr. Stevenson. *Thockerington*, p. c. Prebendary. *Westow*, v. abp. of York.
- Alban, T. *Llandrillo*, v. bp. of St. Asaph. *Eaton*, v. H. and W. Lloyd. *Snead*, c. P. Morris.
- Aldrich, W. *Boyton*, r. lord Rous. *Stowe-Market*, v. with *Stowe-Upland*, c. Mr. Aldrich.
- Allen, R. *Driffeld*, r. precentor of York. *Whaream Pier*, v. Misses Isted and Englefield. *Little*, p. c. Unknown.
- Allen, S. *Haslingfield*, v. C. Mitchell. *Lynn*, *St. Margaret and St. Nicholas*, c. dn. and ch. of Norwich.
- Allen, D. B. preb. of St. David's and Brecon; *Burton*, r. sir W. Owen. *Manordiffy*, r. *Llandewn Welfrey*, r. the King.
- Allen, S. *Dunton*, v. T. W. Coke. *Wolterton*, r. with *Wickmere*, r. earl Oxford.
- Allfree, E. M. minor canon of Rochester; *Canterbury*, *St. Andrew*, r. and *St. Mary*, *Bredon*, r. abp. of Cant. and dn. and ch. of Cant. *Strood*, r. dn. and ch. of Rochester.
- Alison, A. preb. of Sarum; *Ercall*, v. H. Pulteney. *Roddington*, r. the King.

The pluralist is senior minister of the episcopal chapel, Canongate, Edinburgh, and a native of Scotland; but being related to the late bishop Douglas, that prelate gave him a stall in his cathedral, and procured for him the vicarage of High Ercall, in Shropshire, to which was afterwards added the rectory of Roddington, in the same county. Mr. Alison is the author of a work on *Taste*.

* Parliamentary Paper, No. 472, Sess. 1830.

Allington, W. *Bardford Lit. r. Twywell, r. J. Williamson. Swinhop, d. Mrs. Allington.*

Anson, H. *Buxton, v. with Oxnead, r. and Skeyton, r. lord Anson. Lyng, r. with Whitwell, v. T. Anson.*

Uncle of lord Anson, master of the buckhounds. Another uncle is rector of Longford, and rector of Sudbury, of which benefices Mr. Coke of Norfolk, and lord Vernon, both connected with the family by marriage, are respectively the patrons.

Ashfield, C. R. *Great Blakenham, r. Eton Coll. Dodington, r. duke Buckingham. Stewkley, v. bp. of Oxon. London, St. Benet Finch, c. dn. and canons of Windsor.*

Apthorpe, F. *preb. of Lincoln; Bicker, v. dn. and ch. of Lincoln. Farndon, v. with Balderton and Fiskerton, cs. preb. of Lincoln. Gumley, r. dn. and ch. of Lincoln.*

The grandfather of this gentleman was a merchant at Boston, in America. His father was rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, and had the valuable prebend of Finsbury, in St. Paul's. His brother-in-law, Dr. Cory, is master of Emanuel College, Cambridge. Another brother-in-law is master of Shrewsbury grammar-school.

Atlay, H. *Great Casterton, r. Pickworth, r. marq. Exeter. Great Ponton, preb. of Sarum.*

Astley, H. N. *Foulsham, r. sir H. Astley. Little Snoring, r. with Bashan, v. bp. of Norwich.*

Atkinson, R. *Musgrove, r. bp. of Carlisle. Upelby, c. J. B. Elliot. Claxby with Normanby, r. Rd. Atkinson.*

Bagot, Richard, bishop of Oxford and dean of Canterbury.

Brother of lord Bagot and of sir C. Bagot, ambassador to the Netherlands, who married a daughter of lord Maryborough.

Bankes, E. king's chaplain and preb. of Gloucester and Norwich; *Corfe Castle, r. Henry Bankes, M.P.*

Son-in-law of lord Eldon. The inhabitants of Corfe Castle must feel greatly indebted to the member for Dorsetshire: he appoints one of his sons to watch over their spiritual welfare, and sends another into the house of commons to take care of their temporal affairs.

Baker, T. canon res. of Chichester; *Bexhill, v. Rodmell, r. bp. of Chichester. Falmer, v. earl Chichester.*

Barker, F. H. *St. Alban's, St. Stephen, v. A. Fisher. North Church, r. the King. Steppingley, r. duke Bedford.*

Barker, T. *Acaster Malb. v. T. B. Thompson. Kilburn, p. c. Thirkleby, v. abp. of York.*

Barrington, viscount, preb. of Durham; *Sedgefield, r. with Embleton, c. bp. of Durham.*

Bathurst, Henry, bishop of Norwich; *Sapperton, r. earl Bathurst.*

Bathurst, H. archdn. of Norwich; *North Creak, r. earl Spencer. Oby, r. with Ashby, r. and Thurne, r. bp. of Norwich.*

Barrow, R. vic. chor. Southwell; *Barnoldby le Beck, r. Halloughton, p. c. South Muskham, v. Rampton, v. South Wheatley, r. Southwell, Collegiate chapter.*

Bartlett, T. *Canterbury All Saints, r. All Saints St. Mary's church, r. All Saints St. Mildred, r. lord Chan. Kingston, r. sir E. Brydges.*

- Bartlett, W. P. *Great Cranford*, v. G. T. Brice. *Cranford*, r. earl Berkeley. *Worth Maltravers*, v. rev. T. C. Bartlett.
- Bastard, J. *Stratfieldsay*, r. *Stratfieldsay Turgis*, r. duke Wellington. *Belchalwell*, r. *Fifehead Neville*, r. lord Rivers.
- Basnett, T. G. vic. chor. of Southwell; *Bonsall*, r. dn. Lincoln. *Edingley*, v. *Halam*, p. c. Southwell College.
- Beadon, F. *North Stoneham*, r. J. Fleming. *Sulham*, r. J. Wilder. *Titley*, p. c. Winton Coll.
- Chancellor and canon res. of Wells. Several other Beadons are in the church, who are indebted for their preferments to the late bishop of Bath and Wells, who had been tutor to the duke of Gloucester.
- Beaucklerk, lord F. *Kempton*, v. *Redburn*, *St. Alban's*, *St. Michael*, v. lord Verulam.
- Beauchamp, Brian, *Cove*, c. chapel in Tiverton. *Hawkridge*, v. with *Withypoole*, c. Miss Wood. *Thoverton*, c. vic. Thoverton.
- Beauchamp, T. W. H. *Chedgrave*, r. *Langley*, c. *Buckenham Ferry*, r. with *Hassingham*, r. sir T. B. Proctor.
- Becher, J. T. preb. of Southwell; *Hoveringham*, p. c. sir R. Sutton. *Thurgorton*, p. c. Trinity Coll. Camb. *Farnsfield*, v. Southwell Coll.
- Beckett, G. preb. of Lincoln; *Barnsley*, p. c. abp. of York. *Epworth*, r. the King. *Gainsborough*, v. preb. of Corringham.
- Beever, Miles, *Bircham Newton*, r. earl Orford. *Toft Bircham*, r. sir T. Beever, bt. *Hethell*, r. *Ketteringham*, v. E. Atkins.
- Bellaman, J. *Ewerby*, v. lord Chan. *Kirkby Green*, v. the King. *Kyme South*, c. sir A. Hume.
- Belfield, F. *St. Martin*, r. viscountess Sandwich. *Stoke Gabriel*, v. *Exbourne*, r. F. Belfield.
- Beynon, T. archdn. of Cardigan, preb. of St. David's and Brecon; *Llanfchangel Aberbythych*, r. bp. of St. Asaph. *Llandevey*, p. c. *Llanvihan Kilwayn*, r. *Penboyr*, r. with *Ydrindod*, c. earl Cawdor.
- Berkeley, H. R. fellow of Winton Coll.; *Cotheridge*, c. Himself. *Shelsea Beauchamp*, r. lord Foley. *Onibury*, r. bp. of Hereford.
- Bertie, hon. F. *Aldbury*, r. *Wooton*, p. c. *Wigtham*, r. earl Abingdon.
- Bethell, Christopher, D.D. bishop of Bangor; *Kirkly Wiske*, r. duke Northumberland.
- Biddulph, T. T. *Bristol*, *St. James's*, c. corp. of Bristol. *Durston*, d. rev. R. Gray. *Lyneham*, c. Mr. Long.
- Binney, H. *Hackthorne*, v. *Hanworth Cold*, r. Rt. Cracroft. *West Moulsey*, p. c. rev. Dr. Binney.
- Birch, Samuel, D.D. president of Sion Coll. preb. of St. Paul's, and professor of geometry at Gresham College; *St. Mary Woolnoth*, and *St. Mary Woolchurch*, r. London, the King and Mr. Thornton alternately; the former this turn.

As this gentleman is one of the Gresham professors we shall beg leave to make a little inquiry. It is well-known that sir Thomas Gresham, the munificent founder of the Royal Exchange, for the convenience of commerce, was also

the founder of a college for the advancement of learning; that the rents of the former were bequeathed for the maintenance of the college; that seven learned men were perpetually to reside there, for the cultivation of science; and that during term time—every day—they were to deliver, in English and Latin, gratuitous lectures to the public, on astronomy, civil law, music, rhetoric, geometry, divinity, and medicine. All the remains of this endowment are the professors, their salaries of £100 per annum each, and an obscure nook in the south-east angle of the Exchange, adjoining the premises of our publisher; no lectures are delivered, or none that the public think worth hearing. We have heard the lectures are about being revived at the London Institution, and that the only cause of the delay is that the reverend lecturers required a little time for *preparation*, not having anticipated it would ever be their lot to have to appear *professionally* in so conspicuous a place. Now we should wish Dr. Birch to inform us when he and his brother collegians are likely to be *ready*, as we have a strong desire to hear a Gresham professor. It is not pleasant to be always reverting to abuses; but there is such a principle of vitality in them that it is only by repeated exposures they can be rooted out.

Birch, Thomas, D.C.L. dn. of Battle, archdn. of Lewes; *Westfield*, v. bp. of Chichester.

Blandford, Joseph, *Carlton in Moreland*, v. w. *Stapleford*, c. lord Middleton. *Kirton*, r. *Mapplebeck*, c. duke Newcastle. *Wellow*, c. hon. and rev. J. L. Savile.

Blomberg, F. W. canon res. of St. Paul's, deputy clerk of the king's closet, chap. in ord. to H. M.; *Bradford*, v. w. *Atworth*, *Holt*, *Stoke*, *Wraxhall*, *Winsley*, and *South*, cs. dn. and ch. of Bristol. *Shepton Mallett*, r. the King.

Blomfield, Charles James, D.D. bishop of London, provincial dean of Canterbury, and dean of the chapels royal.

Bower, H. *Orchard Portman*, r. *Taunton*, *St. Mar.* r. *Staple Fitzpoine*, r. E. B. Portman.

Bowes, T. F. F. chaplain to the king; *Cowlam*, r. *Cake*, r. B. F. Bowes. *Barton le Clay*, r. the King.

Bradley, W. *Baddesley Ensor*, p. c. Inhabt. of Polesworth. *Merevale*, c. D. S. Dugdale. *Whitacre Over*, c. earl Howe.

Brice, J. *Aisholt*, r. Incumbent. *Grenton*, r. S. Kekewich. *Catcott*, p. c. lord Henniker.

Bromley, W. D. *Bagginton*, r. *Oxhill*, r. rev. W. D. Bromley. *Copesthorpe*, c. D. Davenport.

Brown, H. *Ayleston*, r. with *Little Glen*, c. *Lubbesthorpe*, c. duke Rutland. *Hoby*, r. Incumbent.

Father-in-law of the rev. Gilbert Beresford, rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, by whom Ayleston was resigned on account of the distance.

Brown, L. R. *Carlton*, r. with *Kelsale*, r. rev. B. Bence. *Prestbury*, v. Mrs. Leigh. *Saxmundham*, r. D. L. North. *Thorington*, r.

Browne, J. H. archdeacon of Ely; *Cotgrave*, 1st *Mediety*, r. 2d *Mediety*, r. *Eakring*, r. earl Manvers.

Browne, W. *Charsfield*, p. c. W. Jennens. *Great Glemham*, c. with *Little Glemham*, r. D. L. North. *Marlesford*, r. A. Arce-deckne.

Buckle, W. *Banstead*, v. rev. W. Buckle. *Pirton*, v. Christ Church, Oxon. *Shireborn*, v. lord Macclesfield.

Bulwer, A. *Haydon*, r. W. W. Bulmer. *Cawston*, r. Pemb. Hall. *Corpusty*, v. sequestrated.

Burgess, Thomas, D.D. bp. of Salisbury, and provincial precentor of Canterbury.

Burgess, Geo. *Atherington*, r. Fra. Bassett. *Halvergate*, v. bp. of Ely. *Moulton*, v. *Tunstall*, c. rev. H. Anguish.

A relation of the bishop of Salisbury and of the duke of St. Alban's. The bishop is the son of a grocer at Odiham, Hants, where he was born, about 1755. His first patron was the bishop of Durham, who gave him a prebend, first in the cathedral of Salisbury, and afterwards at Durham. At Durham he continued till the administration of Mr. Addington (now Sidmouth), who had been his companion at Winchester College, conferred on him, in 1802, the See of St. David's. In 1796, the bishop married a Miss Bright of Durham, half-sister of the marchioness of Winchester.

Burrard, Geo. *Middleton-Tyas*, r. the King. *Yarmouth*, r. *Shal-fleet*, v. sir H. B. Neale.

This pluralist is also a magistrate and a king's chaplain. He is brother to sir H. Burrard Neale and to lady Rook, who has a pension, and son-in-law to admiral Bingham.

Butler, Samuel, D.D. archdn. of Derby, preb. of Lichfield; *Kenilworth*, v. lord Chan.

Several more Butlers are in the church. Dr. Butler is head master of Shrewsbury grammar-school. He married a daughter of Dr. Apthorpe, a pluralist. His son, W. Butler, is author of a pamphlet on the French Revolution.

Bull, archdn. D.D. preb. York, canon res. of Exeter, archdn. of Barnstaple; *Lezant*, r. bp. of Exeter.

Butler, W. J. *Nottingham*, *St. Nicholas*, r. *Thwing*, 1st *Mediety*, r. 2d *Mediety*, r. lord Chan.

Calvert, W. *Childerly*, r. *Hunsdon*, r. *Pelham Stocking*, r. Nicholas Calvert.

Candler, P. *Burnham Market*, v. lord Chan. *Little Hautboys*, r. *Lammas*, c. rev. P. Candler. *Letheringsett*, r. Mrs. Burrell.

Carr, G. *Great Eversden*, v. lord Chan. *Little Eversden*, r. Queen's Coll. *Ipswich*, *St. Margaret*, c. rev. W. Fonnereau. *Ipswich*, *St. Mary*, c. Parishioners.

Cage, Ed. *Bearsted*, v. dn. and ch. of Rochester. *Badlesmere*, r. *Eastling*, r. *Newnham*, v. *cum Leveland*, r. lord Sondes.

Campbell, C. *Wesenhams*, *All Saints*, v. *St. Peter*, v. *Shingham*, r. *Beechamwell*, *All Saints*, r. the King.

Canon, R. *Broxholme*, r. *North Carlton*, p. c. lord Monson. *Westbury-on-Trim*, p. c. *with Minehampton*, c. G. Edwards and J. Baker, alternately.

Cantley, T. *Cambridge*, *St. Clement*, Camb. *Griston*, v. bp. of Ely. *Gawston*, v. R. Huddleston.

Carey, Wm. bp. of St. Asaph and preb. of Westminster.

Carr, Robert James, bp. of Chichester, canon res. of St. Paul's, and clerk of the closet to the king.

The prelate is brother of sir H. W. Carr, the gentleman who married Perceval's widow before alluded to in the *Pension List*.

Capper, G. *Blackenham*, *Lit.* r. Gosbeck, *St. Mary*, r. T. Vernon. *Wherstead*, v. the King.

Capper, J. preb. of Chichester; *Ashurst*, r. duke Dorset. *Wilmington*, v. hon. G. A. H. Cavendish. *Lollington*, v. bp. of Chichester.

Casberd, J. T. preb. of Wells and Llandaff; *Eglwystowis*, r. R. Jones. *Llanover*, v. ch. of Llandaff. *Llantude*, v. *Penmark*, v. dn. and ch. of Gloucester. *Lysevanoth*, v. lord Plymouth. *Mamlad*, c. *Trevethan*, c. vic. of Llanover.

Champness, T. minor canon, Westminster and Windsor; *Cottesford*, r. Eton Coll. *Upton*, v. the King. *Fulmer*, c. *Wyrardsbury*, v. with *Langley*, c. dn. and canons of Windsor.

Chaplin, W. *West Halton*, r. abp. of Canterbury. *Raithby*, r. with *Hallington*, r. and *Maltby*, c. lord Chan. *Hougham*, v. sequestrated.

Several more Chaplins in the church; they are cousins of the late archbishop Sutton.

Chandler, G. dean of Chichester; *Southam*, r. *Marylebone*, *All Souls*, *Langham Place*, r. the King.

Chester, W. *Denton*, r. abp. of Cant. *Woodrising*, r. J. Weyland. *Walpole*, *St. Peter*, r. the King.

Clarke, J. S. canon of Windsor, dep. clerk of the closet to the King, chap. in ord. to H. M. *East Preston*, w. *Hove*, v. *Tillington*, r. lord Egremont.

Son of the late rev. Edward Clarke, rector of Buxted, Sussex; he was formerly a chaplain in the navy, and owed his appointment in the royal household to his intimacy with admiral Payne. He is author of a *Life of Nelson*, and established the periodical miscellany the *Naval Chronicle*.

Clapham, Samuel, *Christchurch*, v. with *Bransgore*, c. and *Holdenhurst*, c. dn. and ch. of Winton. *Gussage*, *St. Mic.* r. I. and R. Randall. *Great Ouseborn*, v. the King.

This gentleman is a native of Leeds, Yorkshire, where he was educated. He was first patronized by lord Loughborough, then lord chancellor, who presented him to the living of Great Ouseborn. As a remuneration for his *Abridgement of the Bishop of Winchester's (Pretymen) Elements of Christian Theology*, that prelate obtained for him the vicarage of Christchurch and the rectory of Gussage. He is an acting magistrate for the county, and compiled an *Index to Burn's and Williams's Justice, Blackstone's, Hawkins', &c. law-books*.

Clarkson, T. *Hinxton-Combes*, v. *Swovesey*, v. Camb. *Acton Scott*, r. R. J. Stackhouse.

Cleaver, J. F. preb. of Southwell. *Holme Pierrepont*, r. earl Mansvers. *Appleton-in-the-Street*, v. *Amotherby*, c. Camb.

Cleaver, J. *Edwinstow*, v. *Ollerton*, c. *Carburton*, c. *Polethorpe*, c. dn. and ch. Lincoln.

Cleaver, J. F. canon and reg. of St. Asaph. *Corwen*, r. *Rug*, c. bp. St. Asaph. *Great Coxwell*, v. bp. of Sarum.

The pluralists owe their preferments to their father, the bishop of St Asaph, who died in 1815. The bishop was tutor to the marquis of Buckingham, with whom he went to Ireland during his viceroyalty. His brother was first made bishop of Ferns, then archbishop of Dublin. He himself first obtained a prebend of Westminster, was next elevated to the see of Chester, and, after one or two more moves, to the see of St. Asaph. He married a Miss Asheton, sister of Wm. A. of Lancashire, from whom the present are descended.

Cobbold, T. *Ipswich*, *St. Mary Tower*, c. Parishioners. *Welby*, r. rev. N. White. *Woolpet*, r. rev. T. Cobbold.

There are three more Cobbolds in the church, one vicar of Selbourne, and a witness at the Winchester trials; a riotous assemblage of farmers and labourers had endeavoured to compel the reverend gentleman to consent to reduce his tithes from £600 to £400 a year, the last—four pounds a week—being deemed sufficient remunerations to a parish priest in the opinions of the rural logicians. In the existing state of popular feeling, how is it possible for the tithe system to be upheld? it does not answer a single good purpose; and its compulsory exaction is wholly impracticable. The ends of religion can never be furthered by an impost which generates social animosity, and tends to exhibit ministers and parishioners more in the relation of wolves and sheep than pastors and their flocks.

Coldham, J. *Anmer*, r. J. Coldham. *Snettisham*, r. H. Styleman.
Stockton, r. P. Randall.

Combe, E. *Barrington*, p. c. rev. Dr. W. Palmer. *Donyatt*, r.
Earnshill, r. *Drayton*, p. c. R. T. Combe.

Colson, T. M. *Pilesdon*, r. with *Stratton*, c. hon. C. Damer. *Chamminster*, c. Mr. Trenchard. *Linkenholt*, r. Mrs. Worgan.

Collet, A. *Aldringham*, c. with *Thorpe*, c. *Great and Little Linstead*, c. lord Huntingfield. *Heveningham*, r. the King.

Collett, W. *Swanton Morley*, r. sir J. Lambe. *Surlingham*, r. rev. W. Collett. *Egmere*, r. T. W. Coke.

The parishioners of Surlingham have given to the rector the alternative of either accepting a compensation for tithes, or gathering *them in kind*; the reverend pluralist dexterously endeavours to ward off this blow, by sowing division in the enemy's camp; and in a hand-bill, (dated 11th Dec. 1830,) signifies his intention to distribute, as a gift, among the "poor and deserving families of his parish," all the eggs, milk, pigs, poultry, and fruit, which shall in future belong to him, as small tithes, on the occupations of certain of the *rebels* whose names are mentioned. What a cunning ruse! it is a pity this worthy gentleman did not think of the "poor and deserving families" before the FIRES, and the union of the labourers and farmers. Other persons have endeavoured to conciliate their parishioners, by circulating handbills, in which they try to prove that tithes are good things for the labourers—that they do not oppress the farmer, being only *part of his rent*, which if not paid to the incumbent, would be exacted by the landlord—and that the *average* incomes of the benefited clergy are so small that it is impossible they should be objects of cupidity with any reasonable person. All these sophistries we have exposed; it is not the *average* income of the clergy, but the total amount of the revenues of the church and the *unequal* distribution of them that are objected to; neither is it meant that tithe should be simply abolished—that would certainly only add to the rent of the landlords—but that it should be *commuted* for an equivalent and less objectionable assessment, levied on the landed interest, and this commutation be available to the relief of the productive classes.—On these matters, see p. 49-51 and p. 74.

Corbett, S. LL.D. *Kirkhamwith*, r. chan. du. Lancaster. *Scrayingham*, r. with *Leppington*, c. the King. *Wortley*, e. rec. of Tankersley.

Cooke, G. *Rissington Wick*, r. the King. *Cubbington*, v. *Honingham*, p. c. I. H. Leigh.

Professor of natural philosophy, and keeper of the archives in the University of Oxford.

Cornwall, F. H. W. bishop of Worcester; consecrated bishop of Bristol, 1797, translated to Hereford 1803.

Copleston, Edw. bp. of Llandaff and dn. of St. Paul's.

Crabbe, Geo. *Trowbridge*, r. *Staverton*, c. *Croxton Kerrial*, v. duke Rutland.

A popular poet, who was chaplain to the late duke of Rutland, from whom he obtained his preferments, and whose funeral sermon he preached at Belvoir.

Crawley, C. *Broadwater*, v. Miss Mills. *Flaxley*, d. sir J. Crawley.

Stow, *Nine Churches*, r. rev. J. L. Crawley.

Croft, James, archd. and preb. of Canterbury. *Cliffe-at-Hone*, r. *Saltwood*, r. w. *Hythe*, c. abp. of Cant.

Married a daughter of the late archbishop Sutton.—See p. 23.

Crook, Ch. *Bath*, *St. Peter and St. Paul*, v. *St. Mary Mag. Ch. St. Michael*, r. *Widcombe*, c. Mayor and Corporation.

Cust, Henry, *Cockayne-Hatley*, r. *Sywell*, r. *Raisen Mid. Topholm*, v. earl Brownlow. *Willoughby*, *St. Helen*, r. lord Gwydyr.

Dallen, J. vic. chor. York. *Rudston*, v. *Trinity in Goodramgate*, r. *St. John Delpike*, r. and *St. Maurice without Monk*, v. abp. of York.

Dampier, J. *Codford*, *St. Peter*, r. H. Kellow. *Langton Matravers*, r. Incumbent. *Pitcombe*, c. *Brewham*, c. sir R. C. Hoare.

Davies, G. J. *Grovenhurst Superior*, r. Trustees. *Marfleet*, c. H. Grylls. *Sutton*, c. H. Broadley.

Davy, Geo. M.A. dean of Chester; vacated by Dr. Phillpotts.

Davy, C. *Barking*, r. *Combes*, r. *Badley*, c. earl Ashburnham.

Dawson, F. *Chiselhurst*, r. *Hayes*, r. *Orpington*, (sinecure,) r. *with Down*, c. abp. of Cant.

Day, G. minor canon of Norwich. *Barton Bendish*, r. sir H. Berney. *Hemblington*, c. *Norwich Eaton*, v. dn. and ch. of Norwich.

Day, J. *Seething*, c. *St. Peter*, *Mundham*, c. Corp. of Norwich. *Yelverton*, r. lord Chan.

Digby, C. canon of Windsor. *Chiselboro'*, r. *with West Chinnock*, c. *Middle Chinnock*, r. *Penselwood*, r. lord Ilchester.

Dillon, H. L. *Carhampton*, v. Mrs. Langham. *Carhampton*, p. c. H. P. Wyndham. *Litchet*, r. W. Trenchard.

Dixon, W. H. preb. of York and Ripon. *Bishopsthorpe*, v. abp. of York. *Cawood*, c. preb. of Wistow. *Mappleton*, v. archdn. E. Riding. *Topcliffe*, v. dn. and ch. of York.

Doveton, J. F. *Betchworth*, v. dn. and ch. of Windsor. *Burnet*, r. Corp. of Bristol. *Mells*, r. *with Leigh on Mendip*, c. T. G. Horner.

D'Oyley, Geo. *Lambeth*, r. *with Stockwell*, c. *Sundridge*, r. abp. of Cant.

Chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury, and christian advocate in the University of Cambridge.

Dudley, J. *Humberstone*, v. Incumbent. *Sileby*, v. W. Pochin. *Himby*, r. earl Dudley.

Dowland, J. J. G. *Broad Windsor*, v. the King. *Turnworth*, v. bp. of Sarum. *Winterbourne Whitchurch*, v. E. M. Pleydell.

Edge, W. *Hollesley*, r. *Noughton*, r. *Nedging*, r. rev. W. Edge.

Ellicott, J. *Exton*, v. *Lavenfield*, v. *with Brayfield*, c. *Hornfield*, r. sir G. N. Noel.

Ellis, J. *Llangamdimell*, v. *Llankerrig*, r. bp. St. David's. *Llanbadrig*, v. the King. *Wooten Waven*, *with Uttenhall*, c. King's Coll. Cambridge.

England, W. archdn. of Dorset. *Ower Moine*, r. *Winterbourne Carne*, r. and *St. Germain*, r. lady Damer. *West Stafford*, r. Mrs. Floyer.

Fardell, H. preb. of Ely. *Bexwell*, r. *Waterbeach*, v. bp. of Ely. *Feltwell*, *St. Mary and St. Nicholas*, lord Chan. and bp. of Ely, alternately.

Fellowes, J. *Bramerton*, r. *Easton*, r. *Mottisham Mantby*, r. R. Fellowes. *Bratton Clovelly*, r. bp. of Exeter.

Field, R. *Mendlesham*, v. Pearson and Wyatt. *Sutton*, *All Saints*, v. Oxon. *Ramsholt*, c. J. Pennington.

Finch, H. *Oakham*, v. with *Barleythorpe*, c. and *Brooke*, c. *Langham*, c. *Eggleton*, c. lord Winchelsea.

Finch, H. *Great Melford*, v. *Little Melford*, r. W. F. Finch. *Longstanton*, *All Saints*, bp. of Ely.

Nine Finches in the church, with eighteen livings, besides dignities. Most of them are *honourables*, and branches of the family of lord Winchelsea.

Fisher, John, archdn. of Berks, can. res. of Sarum. *Gillingham*, v. w. *East and West Stover*, c. *Motcombe*, c. *Osmington*, v. bp. of Salisbury.

Fisher, Jona. P. D.D. canon res. of Exeter. *Farringdon*, r. *Rockbear*, v. bp. of Exeter.

Fisher, P. *Elton*, r. Messrs. Shafto and Hogg. *Whapload*, v. the King. *Stoke Canon*, d. dn. and ch. of Exon.

Thirteen more *Fishers* with benefices and offices. They are all, we suspect, relations of the late bishop of Salisbury, and are an instance of that monopoly which is the disgrace of the establishment. The bishop was preceptor to the princess Charlotte of Wales and the duke of Kent. Having obtained a prebend of Windsor and the archdeaconry of Exeter, he was, in 1803, promoted to that see; and, in 1808, translated to Salisbury. The patronage of the diocese is forty livings and thirty-five prebends, from which fund he made a comfortable provision for his family. P. Fisher, beside his three livings, has a prebend at Norwich, and another at Salisbury, and is head master of the Charter-house. This man is really insatiable. His salary at the Charter-house is £800 a year, with a house, candles, vegetables, and an allowance for linen. He had a nephew lately on the foundation, and two sons exhibitioners at the Universities, with allowances of £80 a year from the charity.

Fletcher, W. chan. of d. of Carlisle, and preb. of York. *Bromfield*, v. *Dalston*, v. *Lazonby*, v. bp. of Carlisle.

Fly, H. D.D. sub-dean of St. Paul's, London. *Trinity*, *Minories*, c. the King. *Willesdon*, v. *Kingsbury*, p. c. with *Twysford*, c. dn. and ch. of St. Paul's.

Forester, T. preb. of Worcester. *Broseley*, r. *Little Wenlock*, with *Barrow*, c. and *Benthall*, c. lord Forester. *Worcester*, *St. John Bedwardine*, v.

Foxton, G. *Queensbury*, v. with *Ragdale*, c. E. Loveden. *New Town*, r. bp. of St. Asaph. *Twining*, v. Christ-church, Oxon.

Frome, R. *Folke*, r. rev. W. Chafin. *Goathill*, r. earl Digby. *Mintern*, r. Mrs. Sturt.

Gabell, H. D. *Ashow*, r. C. Leigh. *Binfield*, r. *Winchester*, *St. Laurence*, r. lord Chan.

Garnier, Thomas, *Bishop's Stoke*, r. *Brightwell*, r. *Foxhall*, c. bp. of Winton.

The patronage of the church is an excellent resource for forming comfortable marriage-settlements. A son of the pluralist married a daughter of Brownlow North, late bishop of Winchester, and was portioned off with the rectory of Droxford, a prebend of Winchester, and the mastership of St. Cross's Hospital, which has great patronage. A daughter married Thomas, the second son of lord Walsingham, who is archdeacon of Surrey, prebendary of Winchester, rector of Colbourne, and king's chaplain. A son of this last is prebendary of Winchester, and rector of Alverstoke and of Havant. The Norths, who are numerous in the church, are relations of the former bishop of Winchester, and had more than *thirty livings* shared among them.

Geldart, J. *Aldfield*, c. Mrs. Laurence. *Barnwell*, c. *Cambridge Less*, c. *Kirk Deighton*, r. rev. Dr. Geldart.

Goddard, C. archdn. and preb. of Lincoln, chaplain to the king; *Bexley*, v. viscount Sidney. *Louth*, v. preb. of Louth. *London*, *St. James's*, *Garlickhythe*, r. bp. of London.

Goddard, E. *Eartham*, v. preb. of Eartham. *Pagham*, v. with *Bognor*, c. abp. of Cant. *Sidlesham*, v. preb. of Sidlesham.

Goodacre, W. *Mansfield Woodhouse*, p. c. *Skegby*, p. c. duke Portland. *Sutton Ashfield*, p. c. duke Devonshire.

Goodall, J. provost of Eton Coll. canon of Windsor; *Bromham*, v. *Hitcham*, r. Eton Coll. *West Ilsley*, r. dn. and cns. of Windsor.

The rev. pluralist being the head of a great public school, we shall give a brief account of one of these foundations, the boasted nursery of our *legislators and statesmen*. They are receptacles of abuse, and present a singular contrast to similar institutions in a neighbouring country; while the latter produce philosophers, heroes, and patriots, the former send forth a plentiful crop of exquisites, air-gun shooters, and at best pedants and Payleyean politicians. From the seed sown such fruit may be expected; the scholar's time is mispent in grammatical and metrical trifling, and little is read or studied but Horace, Virgil, and Homer. Leaving these matters, let us come to the foundation of Eton and its management.

Eton college is situated near Windsor, and was founded by Henry VI. for the education of *seventy poor and indigent scholars*, who were enjoined by the founder to swear they had not £3 : 6s. a year to spend. The exact amount of the revenues it is not easy to ascertain, as it is a fact carefully concealed by the heads of the college; but, according to the evidence of Mr. Hinde, they amount to considerably more than £10,000 a-year, and arise from various manors, estates, rectories, and tenements belonging to the foundation. The government of the college, and the management of this immense income, is vested in the provost and *seven fellows*; the salaries of the latter, according to the statutes, are £10 a-year, and of the former double that sum. The bishop of Lincoln is visitor. Besides the foundation scholars there are more than 400 *oppidens*, or town scholars, who pay for their education; though, like the rest of the boys, they are entitled to *gratuitous* instruction. The scholars are instructed by masters and assistants, who in fact do all the business of the college, and, as is usual in such cases, get the worst paid; the head master receives only £63 a-year; the under master fares still worse and is paid in a trifling "*allowance of bread and beer*."*

The most interesting subject for inquiry is, what becomes of the revenue when all the work is done at such a cheap rate. Nearly the whole of this, at the present, appears to be divided betwixt the provost and the fellows; the share of the former in *good years* has amounted to £2500; but the incomes of the latter

* Third Report of the Education Committee, Sess. 1818, p. 72.

are made up of such a variety of items, they are not easily estimated. It is certain, however, their incomes are enormous. Besides the total income of the college, thirty-seven livings, some of which, worth £800 per annum, are in the gift of the fellows; they have the power of presenting themselves to one of these livings, which of course would not be the worst. They receive about £550 in money annually from the fines; a yearly stipend of £50; and a liberal allowance for gowns, coals, candles, &c. Moreover, they generally confer some office on themselves in the college, as bursar, precentor, sacrist, or librarian; for which they receive a salary. These are the principal items; but it is impossible to discover exactly what the fellows receive in all: their gross incomes cannot be much less than £1000 a-year.

After *Dr. Goodall* has taken the lion's share, and the fellows nearly as much as they please, the remainder is applied to support the establishment. According to the statutes, the scholars ought to be fed, clothed, educated, and lodged, free from expense; they have reduced their meals to two, namely, dinner and supper; clothing they have none; for their education they pay a gratuity of six guineas to the master, and their other yearly expenses amount to about *sixty pounds*; while, at the same time, they swear, or ought to swear, they have not *three pounds six shillings a year to spend!*

These exactions are, however, so shameless, unjustifiable, and so directly in the teeth of the statutes, that when any person ventures to object to their payment, to prevent inquiry, the charges are remitted. This indulgence is extended to a very small number; and to prevent such a dangerous example spreading through the school, the fact is carefully concealed from the rest of the boys. That this illegal demand for teaching may excite as little notice as possible, it is always thrust into the bill of the person with whom the boys board.*

Such is a brief account of the royal college of Eton. It only now remains to point out the more flagrant abuses which prevail in its management, and the manner the *poor* have been robbed of their rights and interests in this celebrated foundation.

First, instead of the revenues being expended in feeding, educating, and clothing, "*seventy poor and indigent scholars*," they are divided among eight clerical sinecurists; and children of opulent persons, who can afford to pay £70 a-year for their education, are alone admitted to the benefits of the foundation. The statutes provide, that one-third part of the yearly saving shall be placed in the treasury, for the use of the college; although there has been annually a surplus revenue to a very considerable amount, instead of being applied to the enlargement of the college, or any other laudable object, it has been divided and pocketed, by the "*reverend fellows*" and the provost; one hundred marks, too, piously left to clothe the "*poor and indigent scholars*," have, in like manner, been shared as lawful plunder by the same reverend persons. In consequence of the spoliation of Edward the IVth. the number of fellows was reduced from ten to seven; but although the revenues have increased so enormously, that they would very well support the old statutable number, yet they have for centuries been kept at the present amount, contrary to the intentions of the founder. Finally, the reverend fellows have all sworn not to obtain a dispensation for the holding of livings; or, if obtained, not to use it; yet, notwithstanding their oaths, notwithstanding the dreadful maledictions of the founder, such has been their greediness for the emoluments of the church, that they have obtained a dispensation to hold church preferment; and the right reverend visitor has sanctioned this infringement of the ordinances of Henry VI.

Goodenough, E. preb. of Westminster, Carlisle, and York; *Wath, All Saints on Dearne, v. Adwick, c. Brampton Bierlow, c. Christ Ch. Oxon.*

Goodenough, S. J. preb. of Carlisle; *Broughton Poges, r. rev. J. Goodenough. Hampton, v. the King.*

* Third Report of Education Committee, p. 71, evidence of the Rev. Dr. Goodall.

Goodenough, William, archdn. of Carlisle, *with Mareham le Fen*, r. *and Great Salkeld*, r. bp. of Carlisle.

Three more Goodenoughs; they are of the family of the late bishop of Carlisle. The prelate obtained the deanery of Rochester in 1802, and in 1808 was promoted to the See of Carlisle, through the interest of lord Sidmouth, his brother having married the sister of the *letter-of-thanks-man*.

Gordon, G. dn. of Lincoln; *Harbling*, v. *with Briggend*, c. bp. of Lincoln. *Whittington*, r. dn. of Lincoln. *Ledgbrook*, 1st and 2d *Mediety*, r. *with East Allington*, c. lord Chan.

Gordon, G. *Bentley Fenney*, r. Dr. Gordon. *Muston*, r. lord Chan. *Whittington*, c. dn. of Lincoln.

Gower, G. L. *St. Mabyn*, r. *St. Michael Penkevil*, r. lord Falmouth. *Tatsfield*, r. *Titsey*, r. W. L. Gower.

Grant, J. T. *Merston*, r. *Wrabness*, r. The King. *Butterleigh*, r. lord Chan.

Grant, R. fellow of Winton Coll.; *Bradford Abbass*, v. marquis Anglesea. *Clifton Maybank*, r. Winton Coll. *Portsea*, *St. Pauls*, p. c. vicar of Portsea.

Gray, Robert, bishop of Bristol, and prebendary of Durham.

Green, J. C. *Rillington*, v. the King. *Thornton-le-Moor*, r. bp. of Ely. *Birdsall*, p. c. marquis Hertford. *Whaream-in-the-Street*, v. lord Middleton. *Rustington*, v. bp. of Chichester.

Grey, hon. Thomas de, archd. of Surrey; *Calbourne*, r. *Fawley*, r. *with Exbury*, c. bp. of Winton. *Merton*, r. lord Walsingham.

The honourable, venerable, and reverend pluralist is, also, a king's chaplain, and prebendary of Winchester. He is brother of lord Walsingham, and related to the Norths and Garniers, whom see. Three more Greys are in the church: one of them is brother of the earl of Stamford, and is rector of Wickham and prebendary of Durham. Another relation of the earl has a living worth £1500 a-year.

Grey, hon. E. dean of Hereford; *St. Botolph*, *Bishopsgate*, r. bp. of London and the King alternately.

Brother of earl Grey and son-in-law, by second marriage, of Robert Adair, esq. the late foreign minister, we believe, mentioned in our *Place List*.—A bishop, lord chancellor, or first lord of the treasury, with vast patronage and a host of expectants about him, always appears to our mind like the man at the head of the table with a fine turkey before him, which he is prepared to carve for the benefit of his family and guests. "Which part do you prefer—here is a leg—the wing or the apron." Just so in the distribution of public offices and preferments; there is a benefice for one, a dignity for another, and an embassy, secretaryship, or commissionership for a third. We do not in this case complain; earl Grey has certainly lost no time in moving his brother nearer a bishopric; but it is not the advancement of the meritorious—though they be *relatives*—but the worthless that excites indignation. The dean, like his predecessor in the parish of St. Botolph, bears an exemplary character, and the public is gratified rather than otherwise by his promotion.

Griffith, C. preb. of Brecon; *Disserth*, r. bp. of St. David's. *Glondegla*, p. c. bp. St. Asaph. *Llanvayes*, v. archdn. of Brecon.

Guildford, earl of, *Alvesford*, *New and Old*, r. *with Medsted*, c. *Southampton*, *St. Mary*, *prec. and r. St. Cross*, *with St. Faith's Master*, bp. of Winchester.

The family, of which his lordship is the head, was some years since widely ramified in the church, engrossing upwards of thirty livings and dignities.

These numerous preferments were derived through *Brownlow North*, uncle of the present lord Guildford and former bishop of Winchester. The bishop was a younger brother of lord North, the minister during whose administration the inglorious war was waged against the independence of North America. The bishop owed his promotion to his brother, and his advancement to the bench was much resisted by the minister's colleagues, on account of his youth. Lord North, however, observed—"that when he should become of more matured age, he would not have a brother prime minister." Under such powerful auspices the bishop rose rapidly in the church. He was first preferred to a canonry of Christ Church, Oxford. A few months afterwards he was pushed into the deanery of Canterbury, and the following year advanced to the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry. Soon after he was translated to Worcester, and in 1781 to the rich See of Winchester, which he held more than forty years, and must have netted from the revenue of his diocese upwards of one million and a half principal money.

Haden, A. B. Ware, c. O. Crewe. *Saddington*, r. *Wednesbury*, v. the King.

Haggitt, D'Arcy, *Branxton*, v. dn. and c. of Durham. *Cornhill*, c. W. N. Darnell. *Pershore St. Andrew*, v. and *Holy Cross*, c. with *Besford*, c. *Brickhampton*, c. *Defford*, c. and *Penvin*, c. dn. and cns. of Westminster.

Harbin, J. *North Barrow*, r. E. B. Portman. *Kingston*, r. Mr. Harbin. *Wheathill*, r. Mrs. Phillips.

Harvey, B. *Alsager*, c. lord of the Manor. *Blackmore*, v. the King. *Doddington*, r. J. Henrick.

Hasted, H. *Bury St. Mary*, c. Corporation. *Chedburg*, r. with *Ickworth*, r. chap. of Worcester. *Braisworth*, r. marquis Cornwallis. *Horningsheath*, r. lord Bristol.

Hett, W. *Enderby Navis*, r. Incumbent. *Greetwell*, c. ch. of Lincoln. *Lincoln, St. John in New*, v. and *St. Paul*, r. archd. of Lincoln. *Dunholme*, v. the King. *Nettleham*, c. chanc. of Lincoln. *Thorpe-on-the-Hill*, r. chap. of Lincoln.

Three rectories, a vicarage, and two chapelries, are not enough for this reverend pluralist. He is prebendary and vicar choral of Lincoln, and chaplain to the marquis of Stafford. His recommendation to all these good things are—The Genuine Tree of Liberty, or the Royal Oak of Great Britain; a political squib of 1793; a Fast-day Sermon; Letter upon Restrictions on Dissenting Teachers, &c.

Holdsworth, Robt. preb. of Exeter; *Brixham*, v. with *Kingsweare*, c. the King. *Dartmouth, St. Sav.* c. Corporation. *Townstall*, v. *Churston Ferrers*, c. corp. of Clifton.

Hales, R. *Hemesby*, v. J. T. Hales. *Herringswell*, r. H. Sperling. *Hillington*, r. sir W. J. B. Folkes.

Hamond, R. *Beechamwell St. John and St. Mary*, r. J. Molleaux. *Pensthorpe*, r. *East Walton*, v. *Gayton Thorpe*, r. A. Hamond.

Hanbury, T. *Burrough*, r. *Somerby*, v. *Langton Church*, r. with *Langton Tur*, c. and *Thorpe Langton*, c. W. Hanbury.

Hankinson, r. *Pentney*, c. sequestrated. *Walpole St. Andrew*, v. T. Hankinson, *West Bilney*, p. c. J. Dalton.

Harries, G. preb. of St. David's. *Letterston*, r. *Llanwair*, c. *Nolton*, r. *Roch*, c. *Rupa Castle yn Graig*, v. lord Chan.

Harries, J. *Langattock*, r. earl Abergavenny. *Llandett*, r. T. H.

Gwynne. *Newcastle in Emlyn*, c. with *Bettws*, c. and *Lla-lestone*, c. T. Lewis.

Hawkesley, J. W. *Knotting*, r. with *Souldrop*, r. rev. J. W. Hawkesley, *Melchburn*, v. lord St. John. *Turvey*, r. D. C. Higgins.

Heathcote, G. archdn. of Winchester, fellow of Winton Coll., treasurer of Wells Cathedral. *Andover*, v. with *Foscot*, c. Winton Coll. *Hursley*, v. *Otterburn*, c. sir G. Heathcote.

Hewgill, F. *Littleborough*, p. c. J. Hewett. *Soundby*, r. *North Wheatley*, v. lord Middleton. *Sturton in the Clay*, v. dn. and ch. of York.

Hill, R. *Berrington*, r. with *Little Ness*, c. *Sutton St. John*, r. *Thornton Mayow*, r. lord Berwick. *Great Bolas*, r. sir R. Hill.

Several other Hills in the church. The pluralist is uncle of lord Hill, commander of the forces, and of Rowland Hill, the well known dissenting preacher.

Hobart, hon. H. L. *Haseley*, r. the King. *Nocton*, v. dn. and ch. of Cant. *Wantage*, v. dn. and cns. of Windsor.

This hon. and very reverend pluralist has two deaneries, that of Windsor, the other of Wolverhampton. A brother is canon of Hereford, and rector of Beer Ferrers; of which rectory, his nephew, the duke of Buckingham, is patron. Another *Hobart*, a son, we suspect, of the plural dean, has a valuable rectory, and prebend of Wolverhampton.

Hodgson, R. dn. of Carlisle. *Burgh on Sands*, v. lord chan. *Westminster*, *St. George's*, *Hanover-square*, r. *Hillingdon*, v. bp. of London.

Nephew of Porteus, late bishop of London. Many other Hodgsons, with livings, offices, and dignities.

Hodson, G. *Birmingham*, *Christ Church*, c. *Colwich*, v. with *Frods-well*, c. bp. of Lich. and Cov. *London*, *St. Katharine Cree*, v. *Magd. Coll.*

Holland, W. Wm. vic. of Chichester cath. *Bapchild*, v. *Burpham*, v. dn. and ch. of Chichester. *Chichester St. Andrew and St. Martin*, r. dn. of Chichester.

Holland, S., M.D. precent. and preb. of Chichester. *Beauesert*, r. *Poynings*, r. *Warehorn*, r. the King.

This is a remarkable instance of the secular uses to which church property is applied by those who have the disposal of it. The reverend pluralist was originally a physician; but, happening to marry a daughter of lord Erskine, while his lordship held the great seal, he took holy orders, with a view to qualify himself for a share of the good things in the gift of his father-in-law. Erskine gave him the three rectories, worth about £2000 a year, during the short period of his chancellorship. Doctor Holland has written a book to vindicate the clergy from the charge of neglecting their duties. Who may the preceding pluralist of this name be?

Holt, J. *Elston*, r. W. B. Darwin. *Gringley*, v. Camb. *Kelstern*, v. sir J. C. Hawkins. *Wrawby*, v. with *Brigg*, c. *Clare Hall*, Camb.

Hoste, J. *Barwick in Brakes*, v. Mrs. Hoste. *Longham*, c. *Wendling*, r. T. W. Coke.

Housen, H. vicar choral of Southwell. *Bleasby*, v. *Howerby*, r. with *Beesby in the Marsh*, c. *Southwell*, v. prec. and preb. of *Normanton*. *Aslacton*, p. c. *Southwell Coll.*

Howard, J. *Fundenhall*, d. T. T. Burney. *Morley*, *St. Botolph and St. Peter*, r. B. N. Cooper. *Tacolneston*, r. Mrs. Warren.

Howard, R., D.D. *Denbigh*, r. bp. St. Asaph. *Llandegfan*, r. with *Beaumaris*, c. *Llanvewgan*, c. R. W. Bulkeley.

Howes, F. min. can. of Norwich. *Attlebridge*, v. with *Alderford*, r. *Bawburgh*, v. Norwich, *St. George*, col. r. dn. and ch. of Norwich.

Howes, T. *Fritton*, r. T. L. Hodges. *Tharston*, v. bp. of Ely. *Thorndon*, r. rev. T. Howes.

Howley, Wm. D.D. archbishop of Canterbury; consecrated bishop of London, 1813, and elevated to the primacy in 1828, on the de-
cease of archbishop Sutton.

We have nothing to add to our notice, page 21, of this prelate. It may be inferred, from the strictness with which the preserves are watched at Addington, and the severe persecution of poachers, that his grace is very fond of *game*.
Hudleston, A. *Bownes*, r. *Morresby*, r. *Whitehaven St. Nicholas*, c. earl Lonsdale.

Hume, T. H. treas. and con. res. of Sarum. *Figheledean*, r. Treas. of Sarum, *Kewstoke*, v. lord Chan. *Stratford-under-Castle*, c. dn. and ch. of Sarum.

Huntingford, G. J. bishop of Hereford; consecrated bishop of Gloucester, 1802; translated 1815.

Hurt, T. *Lindby*, r. *Papplewick*, c. hon. F. Montague. *Scrooby*, v. with *Sutton-on-Lound*, v. duke Portland.

Jacob, S. S. *Waldershore*, v. *Whitfield*, p. c. abp. of Cant. *Wool-lavington*, v. dn. and cans. of Windsor.

Ibbotson, J. *Ayton*, p. c. rev. W. Marwood. *Newton*, p. c. rev. S. Shepherd. *Nunthorpe*, p. c. T. Simpson and W. Richardson.

Ibbotson, T. *Garton*, v. the King. *Lowthorpe*, p. c. sir A. Quentin. *Skerne*, p. c. R. Arkwright.

Jenkinson, J. Banks, bishop of St. David's, dean of Brecon, and dean of Durham.

Jepson, G. preb. and vic. chor. of Lincoln. *Ashby Pueror*, v. *Glen-than*, v. *Normanby*, v. dn. and ch. of Lincoln. *Lincoln St. Botolph*, p. c. preb. of St. Botolph.

Inman, G. *Kilnsea*, v. L. Thompson. *Skefing*, v. rev. N. Holme. *Easington*, v. abp. of York.

Johnson, P. *Beeston*, r. *Sustead*, p. c. the King. *Ingworth*, r. W. Wyndham.

Jones, H. *Lewisham*, v. lord Dartmouth. *Talgarth*, v. dn. and cans. of Windsor. *Mablethorpe*, r. with *Stane*, r. col. Jones.

Iremonger, L. preb. of Winchester. *Wherwell*, preb. sin. *Goodworth Clatford*, v. J. Iremonger. *Kevil*, v. *Wanborough*, v. dn. and ch. of Winton.

Brother in law of lord Gambier, who has a nephew with three livings.

Karslake, W. *Culmstock*, v. dn. and ch. of Exeter. *Dalton*, r. J. Cleveland. *Loxbeare*, r. sir T. D. Acland.

Kaye, John, bishop of Lincoln.

Keith, P. *Marr*, p. c. earl Kinnoul. *Ruckinge*, r. *Stalisfield*, v. abp. Cant.

Kelly, A. P. *Barnham*, p. c. *Little Hampton*, v. bp. Chichester. *Hoxton*, c. archdn. of London.

- Kemphorne, J. preb. of Lichfield. *Gloucester St. Michael*, r. and *St. Marg. de Grace*, c. lord Chan. *Northleach*, v. Preston, v. bp. of Gloucester. *Wedmore*, v. dn. of Wells.
- Kent, G. D. preb. of Lincoln. *Newton*, r. T. Smith. *Lincoln St. Martin*, v. bp. of Lincoln. *Scothern*, v. earl Scarboro'. *Conisholme*, r. hon. Mr. and Mrs. Robinson. *East Winch*, v. E. Kent.
- Kett, W. *Darsham*, v. sir J. Rous. *Shottisham*, r. Mr. Kett. *Waldringfield*, r. N. Randall.
- Keppel, hon. E. G. *Quiddenham*, r. with *Snetterton*, r. *Shottisham All Saints*, v. and *St. Mary*, v. earl of Albemarle. *Tittleshall*, r. with *Godwick*, r. and *Wellingham*, r. T. W. Coke.
Third son of lord Albemarle, master of the horse, and brother-in-law of Mr. Coke, of Norfolk.
- Kidd, T. *Croxton*, r. sir G. W. Leeds. *Eltisley*, v. lord Chan. *Norwich*, *St. Swithin*, r. bp. of Norwich, sequest.
- Kipling, C. *Coston*, r. *Newport Pagnall*, v. lord. Chan. *Wolverton*, v. with *Stratford Tony*, c. W. Drake.
- Kipling, J. *Chearsley*, c. sir C. Dormer. *Chilton*, p. c. *Oakley*, v. sir J. Aubrey. *Upper Winchendon*, p. c. sir C. Cave.
- Knatchbull, W., D. D. *Aldington*, r. with *Smeath*, c. abp. Cant. *Bircholt*, r. lady Bankes. *Wesbere*, r. lord Chan.
- Kynaston, sir E. chap. in ord. to H. M. *Farnham*, *St. Genev.* r. with *Risby*, r. *Kinnersley*, v. the King. *Hordley*, r. J. K. Powell.
- Lade, W. *Graveney*, v. with *Goodnestone*, r. *Wickhamtreux*, r. J. Lade, *Knowlton*, r. sir N. D'Aeth.
- Langdon, G. *Houghton*, r. E. M. Pleydell. *Milton Abb.* v. earl Dorchester. *Weston-Patrick*, p. c. W. T. L. Wellesley.
- Landon, W. dn. of Exeter and preb. of Sarum. *Bishopstone*, r. preb. of Bishopstone. *Branscombe*, v. dn. and ch. of Exeter. *Croft*, r. with *Yarpole*, c. Mrs. Johnes.
- Lates, J. J. *Charlton Abbot*, c. F. Pyson. *Sudely*, r. lord Rivers. *Winchcombe*, v. with *Gretton*, c. lord Tracey.
- Law, G. H. bishop of Bath and Wells; consecrated bishop of Chester, 1812.
- Lax, W. *Ippolitts*, v. with *Great Wymondley*, v. *Marshworts*, v. Camb. *Orwell*, v. rev. J. H. Renouard.
- Lee, H. fellow of Winton Coll. and preb. of Hereford. *Ash*, r. *Frimley*, p. c. *Hound*, v. with *Bursledon*, c. and *Hamble*, p. c. Winton Coll.
- Lewis, D. C. min. can. of Windsor. *Colnbrook*, c. Pem. Coll. Oxon. *Newington*, v. Eton Coll. *Ruislip*, v. dn. and ch. of Windsor.
- Lewis, J. *Buttsbury*, c. rev. D. Lloyd. *Ingatestone*, r. N. W. Lewis. *Ravenhall*, r. C. W. Western.
- Leyson, T. *Bassalleg*, v. bp. Llandaff. *Panteague*, r. *Treddunnoch*, r. C. H. Leigh.
- Linton, H. *Dinton*, v. with *Great Teffont*, c. Mag. Coll. Oxon. *Fritwell*, v. *North Aston*, v. T. F. Willes.
- Long, R. C. *Dunston*, c. Misses S. and G. Long. *Illington*, r. Mrs.

- Kellett. *Newton Flotman*, r. Miss Long. *Swarsthorpe*, r. rev. R. C. Long.
- Lord, J. *Berfreyston*, r. Oxon. *Northiam*, r. Miss Lord. *Drayton Parslow*, r. rev. J. Lord.
- Lowe, J. *Tankersley*, r. *Swinton*, c. *Wentworth*, p. c. earl Fitzwilliam. *Brotherton*, v. dn. and ch. of York.
- Lowndes, R. *Astwood*, v. the King. *North Crawley*, r. Miss Duncombe. *Farley*, r. Oxon.
- Lucas, G. *Caifield*, r. *Stokesby with Heringby*, r. W. Downs. *Billockby*, r. *Filby*, r. C. Lucas.
- Luxmore, C. S. dean, with Heullan, v. annexed, chanc. of see of St. Asaph, and preb. of Hereford. *Bromyard*, 2d Port, r. and v. *West Cradley*, r. bp. of Hereford. *Daroven*, r. *Gurlesfield*, v. bp. of St. Asaph.
- Luxmore, John, joint regist. of Hereford, preb. of St. Asaph. *Berriew*, v. bp. of St. Asaph.
- Three more Luxmores in the church. They are sons and nephews of the late bishop of St. Asaph. The prelate owed his promotion to his connexion with the family of the duke of Buccleugh. He first obtained the living of St. George the Martyr, Queen's-square, which he vacated upon being presented to the neighbouring rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn, which he held, *in commendam*, with the see of Hereford. To the last see he was translated from the diocese of Bristol, before which he held the deanery of Gloucester. He was translated to St. Asaph in 1815. The progress of the bishop, like most of his brethren, may be generally traced from the number of relations and dependents which they leave behind them in possession of the most valuable preferments in their gift.
- Madan, Spencer, preb. and chan. of diocese of Peterborough, chap. in ord. to the King. *Ibstock*, r. with *Hugglescote*, c. *Dunnington*, c. bp. of Rochester. *Thorpe Constantine*, r. W. P. Inge.
- Son of the late bishop of Peterborough, nephew of the late bishop of Lichfield, and cousin of the marquis Cornwallis. Except a *fast-day sermon* or two, we do not know any other claim of this reverend pluralist to his appointments. His uncle, the bishop, to whom he is chiefly indebted for his preferments, was, at first, intended for the bar, and, with that view, entered himself a student of the Temple; but the elevation of his uncle to the archbishopric, on the death of Dr. Secker, opened a more lucrative prospect, and he devoted himself, without any particular call that way, to the church. His first preferment was the rich rectory of Wrotham, in Kent, soon after which he obtained a prebend of Westminster, and shortly after succeeded Dr. Moore in the deanery of Canterbury. On the translation of bishop Hurd, he was raised to the see of Lichfield and Coventry; and, on the death of bishop Douglas, he succeeded him as dean of Windsor, which he vacated for the richer deanery of Durham.
- Maddy, J. *Somerton*, r. Incumbent. *Stansfield*, r. *Hartest*, r. *Boxted*, r. the King.
- Manning, H. C. *Burgh Castle*, r. the King. *Thetford St. Cuth.* c. and *St. Peter*, r. duke Norfolk. *Santon*, r. Corp. of Thetford.
- Mapleton, J. H. *Southwark*, *Christchurch*, r. Trustees of Marshall's charities. *Whaddon*, v. New Coll. Oxon. *Mitcham*, v. Mrs. Simpson.
- Marsh, Herbert, bishop of Peterborough, professor of divinity, Cambridge.
- Marsham, hon. and rev. J. *Allington*, r. earl Romney. *Watering-*

- bury*, v. dn. and ch. of Rochester. *Kirby Overblow*, r. earl Egremont.
- Canon of Windsor, prebend of Bath and Wells, ditto of Rochester. Brother of lord Romney.
- Marshall, C. *Cavenfield*, v. dn. and ch. Rochester. *Edgcott*, r. *Stoke Lyne*, v. J. Coker. *Islington*, v. dn. and cans. Windsor.
- Marshall, E. *Sculthorpe*, r. sir G. Chadd. *Wramplingham*, r. *Stratton Strawless*, r. R. Marshall.
- Massingberd, F. C. *Calceby*, v. *Dribg*, r. *Kettlesby*, r. *South Ormesby*, c. C. B. Massingberd.
- Mavor, W. *Bladon*, r. *Hurley*, v. *Woodstock*, c. duke of Marlborough.
- This is the well-known compiler of useful books, and a native of Aberdeen. He was, at first, a schoolmaster, and being employed by the duke of Marlborough to instruct the junior branches of the family in writing, he obtained such favour as to get a title for holy orders. Soon after he was rewarded with the livings of Hurley and Woodstock. The Society for the Diffusion of Knowledge has produced a good *Almanack*, but nothing so valuable as the doctor's *Spelling-book*.
- Methold, T. preb. of Norwich. *Apsal-stoneham*, r. W. Middleton. *Kilverton*, r. lord Chan. *Wetheringsett*, r. Mrs. Close.
- Millard, C. F. *Henley*, v. *Norwich St. Giles*, r. and at *Palace*, d. dn. and ch. Norwich. *Hickling*, v. Mr. Mickelthwaite.
- Miller, E. *Chesterton*, c. lord Willoughby de Broke. *Radway*, v. *Ratley*, v. lord Chan.
- Millers, G. min. can. of Ely. *Hardwich*, r. *Runham*, v. *Stanford*, v. bp. of Ely.
- Mills, T. chap. to the King. *Bumpstead Helion*, v. Camb. *Little Henney*, r. *Stutton*, r. N. Barnardiston.
- Mitford, J. *Benhall*, v. W. Mitford. *Weston, St. Peter's*, r. the King. *Stratford St. Andrew*, r. chan. of du. of Lancaster.
- Monk, John H. bishop of Gloucester; consecrated in 1830.
- Monins, J. *Charlton, near Dover*, r. *Ringwould*, r. rev. J. Monins. *Fawkenhurst*, r. *Hurst*, r. Miss Carter.
- Moore, G. *Croxby*, r. lord Chan. *Lincoln St. Margaret, with St. Peter*, p. c. precent. and preb. Lincoln Cath. *Owmbly*, r. chan. du. of Lancaster.
- Moore, R. preb. of Canterbury. *Eynesford*, r. *Hollingbourn*, r. *Hunton*, r. *Latchingdon*, r. abp. of Cant.
- Morgan, H. H. can. res. of Hereford. *Fownhope*, v. *Wolhope*, v. dn. and ch. of Hereford. *Moccas*, r. sir G. Cornwall.
- Mounsey, G. *Forest*, c. lord Derby. *Fairfield*, p. c. Trustees. *Rush-ton Spencer*, c. earl Macclesfield.
- Mount, C. *Bath, Christchurch*, c. rev. C. A. Moysey. *Hannington*, v. R. Montgomery. *Helmdon*, r. *Suttonbury*, r. Oxon.
- Moysey, C. A. archdn. of Bath, preb. of Wells. *Bath, Wolcot*, r. dame Gay. *Boarhunt*, d. T. Kethwayte. *Southwick*, d. Mr. Thistlethwayte.
- Muckleston, J. F. preb. and vic. of Lichfield, and preb. of Wolverhampton. *Tong*, p. c. G. Durant, *Weeford*, c. chan. of Lichfield. *Wybunbury*, v. bp. of Lich. and Cov.

Mules, J. H. *Abbot's Isle*, v. dn. and ch. of Bristol. *Broadwater*, c. *Broadway*, c. rev. W. Palmer. *Ilminster*, v. H. Hanning.
 Murray, Geo. bishop of Rochester, dean of Worcester, and rector of Bishopsbourne, Kent.

Nelson, J. vic. chor. of Lincoln. *Ruskington*, v. the King. *Searby*, r. *Wellington*, r. dn. and ch. of Lincoln. *Snarford*, r. sub-dn. of Lincoln. *Lincoln St. Mark*, p. c. precent. of Lincoln.

Nevile, visc. *Byrling*, v. *Holveston*, r. *with Burgh Apton*, r. *Otley*, r. lord Abergavenny.

Third son of the noble patron. Another son is vicar of Trant, in Sussex, and rector of Birling, in Kent.

Newsam, Clement, *Harbury*, v. Miss Newsam. *Portbury*, r. *with Tickenham*, v. bp. of Bristol.

Nicholas, John, D.D. *Bremilham*, r. lady Northwich. *Fisherton Ange*, r. W. H. F. Talbot. *Westport*, v. *with Brockenborough*, c. lord Chan.

Nicolay, G. F. L. one of the brethren of St. Katharine; *Little Marlow*, v. rev. G. F. L. Nicolay. *London, St. Michael Royal and St. Martin Vintry*, r. abp. Cant. and bp. Worcester, *alt.*—See *Nicolay*, in the Place List.

North, Henry. *Heacham*, v. H. Spelman. *Great Ringstead, St. Andrew and St. Peter*, r. H. Styleman.

Northcote, Hugh. *Dowlan*, p. c. *Monkoakhampton*, r. *Okhampton St. James*, r. *Upton Pyne*, r. sir H. Northcote.

Nott, G. F., D.D. preb. of Winton, Chichester, and Sarum. *Harrietsham*, r. All Souls' Coll. *Woodchurch*, r. abp. of Cant.

This gentleman has been for a long time missing; should this meet his eye, we beg to inform him, that the parishioners of Woodchurch are very desirous of seeing him, and they wish to know where he may be found; they have been served with notices for the payment of tithes by the solicitor of the reverend pluralist, who has only been *once* in the parish during the whole of last reign, and that for a day only.

Oakes, James. *Gipping*, d. C. Tyrrel. *Thurston*, v. *Rattlesden*, r. James Oakes, esq. *Tostock*, r. Mr. Moseley.

Oldershaw, John, D.D. archdn. of Norfolk, *with Coston*, p. c. *Ludham*, v. bp. of Norwich. *Ranworth*, v. *with Upton, St. Margaret*, v. bp. of Ely. *Redenhall*, r. *with Hailestone*, c. duke Norfolk, on nom. of bp. of Norwich.

Onslow, G. W. *Send*, v. *with Ripley*, c. earl Onslow. *Wisley*, r. *with Perford*, v. *Shalford*, v. *with Bramley*, c. lord Chan.

Onslow, R. F. archdn. of Worcester, preb. of Sarum. *Kidderminster*, v. w. *Lower Mitton*, c. lord Foley. *Newent*, v. hon. E. Foley.

The venerable archdeacon is son of the late dean of Worcester, whose father was a lieutenant-general, and brother of the famous Arthur Onslow, who was forty years speaker of the Collective Wisdom. A. C. Onslow, rector of St. Mary, Newington-butts, of which benefice the bishop of Worcester is patron, is a brother of the archdeacon.

Oxenden, Mont, *Bonington*, r. T. Papillon. *Luddenham*, r. lord Chan. *Wingham*, p. c. sir H. Oxenden.

Palmer, G. *Leominster*, v. Eton Coll. *Parham*, r. baroness Zouch. *Sullington*, r. N. Tredcroft.

Parkinson, J. D.D. *Brocklesby*, r. lord Yarborough. *Healing*, r. rev. R. Parkinson. *Immingham*, v. W. Amcotts.

Parkinson, T. D.D. preb. St. Paul's, chan. of dioc. of Chester, archdn of Leicester; *Kegworth*, r. with *Isley Walton*, c. Christ Coll. Camb.

As this well-endowed dignitary enjoys a college living, we shall make a remark or two on university patronage: 257 livings are in the gift of the University of Oxford, and 292 in the gift of Cambridge. The livings are situate in different parts of the country; many of them in the metropolis. Some of the livings are annexed to the provostships and professorships of the different colleges, but for the most part they are in the gift of the fellows. By the statutes of the universities the holding of a fellowship is incompatible with the holding of a college living. When, however, a living is more valuable than a fellowship, a fellowship is vacated for the sake of being eligible to the living. Sometimes the statutes are evaded by the college livings being exchanged for others, which the fellows can hold with their college emoluments.

Parsons, H. preb. of Wells; *Durleigh*, v. Mr. Dunning. *Goat-hurst*, r. lady Tynte. *Wembdon*, v. C. K. Tynte.

Payne, Henry Thomas, can. res. of St. David's, preb. of Brecon; *Devunnuck*, v. with *Blaen Glyn Tavy*, c. bp. of Gloucester. *Ystradvellty*, p. c. *Llanbedr*, r. *Patricio*, p. c. duke Beaufort.

Pearce, Thomas, *Folkstone*, v. *Hawkinge*, r. abp. of Cant. *Hartlip*, v. dn. and c. of Roch. *Merston*, r. lord Chanc.

Pellew, hon. G. D.D. dn. of Norwich, preb. of York; *London*, *St. Dionis Backchurch*, r. dn. and can. of Cant.

This honourable and very reverend dignitary is son of lord Exmouth, who has a pension of £2000 a-year, and son-in-law of lord Sidmouth, who has a pension of £3000 a-year. He was originally intended for the legal profession, but his abilities not lying that way, he was, after eating a few terms, turned over to the church. His progress in this line has been very successful: in 1819 he was presented to the vicarage of Naseing, worth £1200 a-year; next year he was presented to the rectory of Sutton, said to be worth £4000 a-year; and, within a few months after he had a prebend's stall in St. Paul's: these appear to have been subsequently resigned or negotiated for his present preferments.

Penrice, Charles, *Smallburgh*, r. bp. of Norwich. *Witton*, r. with *Brundall*, r. and *Little Plumstead*; r. J. Musket.

Pepys, H. preb. of Wells; *Aspeden*, r. lord Hardwicke. *Westmill*, r. *Moreton*, r. St. John's Coll.

Percy, hon. Hugh, D.D. bp. of Carlisle, chan. of Sarum, preb. of St. Paul's.—See page 23.

Perkins, F. D. chap. in ord. to H. M.; *Foleshill*, v. *Ham*, r. *Hatherley-Down*, v. *Sow*, v. *Stoke*, v. *Swayfield*, r. lord Chan.

Perkins, John David, D.D. *Dawlish*, v. bp. Exon, *Exeter*, *St. Laurence*, r. *Manhead*, r. lord Chan.

Pett, Phineas, D.D. archdn. of Oxford, can. of Christ Church, preb. of Sarum; *Chilbolton*, r. bp. of Winton. *Newington*, r. abp. of Cant.

Phillpotts, H. D.D. bishop of Exeter, and prebendary of Durham.

The honest retraction of an error does credit to the heart and understanding; but if a man from mercenary motives suppresses or disguises—for he cannot

abandon them—his convictions, he is a traitor to truth, and merits the most ignominious brand that public opinion can inflict. The most charitable cannot put a favourable construction on the conduct of Dr. Phillpotts, and he is given up, by all parties, as one guilty of unpardonable crimes. The first exploit we remember of this spiritual adventurer was a pamphlet imputed to him in defence of the Manchester massacre, in which 800 poor creatures, men, women, and children, were killed, cut-down, and maimed, under the sabres of a ferocious yeomanry cavalry. He next signalized himself by his writings against catholic emancipation, and finally astonished people by voting for a minister, at Oxford, who was favourable to the catholic relief bill. Thus he was all things to all men, and at last receives his reward—universal contempt and a mitre! As the political bishop had succeeded in fastening on the See of Exeter, we would have suffered him to have held Stanhope rectory too, with the fine house to live in, which cost £12,000: there appears a paltriness in the Whigs attempting to blink the transaction by suffering the prelate to exchange the rectory with Mr. Darnell for a stall at Durham.

Pierce, W. M. *Burwell*, v. *with Walmsgate*, c. *Goulsby*, v. M. B. Lister. *Fulletby*, r. bp. of Lincoln.

Plater, Charles Eaton, *River*, v. *Whitstable*, c. abp. of Cant. *Seasalter*, v. d. and c. of Cant.

Plimley, Henry, chan. of diocese of Chichester, preb. of Chichester; *Cuckfield*, v. *Shoreditch*, v. bp. of Chichester.

Polson, J. H. P. preb. of Exeter; *Exeter Major*, r. d. and c. of Exeter. *Upton Helion*, r. Jos. Polson, esq.

Poore, J. *Bicknor*, r. lord Chan. *Murston*, r. St. John's Coll. *Rainham*, v. abp. of Cant.

Potchett, William, preb. of Sarum; *North and South Grantham*, v. *with Great and Little Gunnerby*, v. *Londonthorpe*, v. and *Braceby*, v. cath. of Sarum.

Pott, Jos. Holden, archdn. of London, preb. of St. Paul's, chan. of Exeter Cath.; *Kensington*, v. bp. of London.

Poulter, Edm. preb. of Winton; *Alton*, v. *with Holybourn*, c. dn. and can. of Winton. *Meonstoke*, r. *with Soberton*, c. bp. of Winton.

Pratt, J. S. preb. of Peterboro'; *Maxey*, v. *Paston*, r. *with Werrington*, c. dn. and cns. of Peterboro'. *Peterboro' &c.* v. bp. of Peterboro'.

Preston, W. preb. of York; *Bulmer*, r. earl Fitzwilliam. *Butterwich*, c. Porson Foord. *Ergham*, r. T. Grimstone. *Sculcoates*, v. The King. *Whenby*, v. W. Garforth. *Wold Newton*, v. hon. M. Langton.

Pretyman, G. T. chan. and can. res. of Lincoln, preb. of Winton; *Chalfont St. Giles*, r. *Wheathampstead*, r. *with Harpenden*, r. bp. of Lincoln.

Pretyman, John, preb. of Lincoln; *Sherrington*, r. *Winwick*, r. bp. of Lincoln.

Pretyman, Richard, prec. and can. res. of Lincoln; *Middleton Stoney*, r. *Walgrave*, r. *with Hannington*, v. bp. of Lincoln. *Wroughton*, r. bp. of Winton.

Having, at page 24, noticed the numerous ecclesiastical emoluments of the Pretymans, we shall only give some account of the rise of the bishop, to whom

the family is indebted for its preferments. Tomline, formerly Pretymán, the late bishop of Winchester, was the son of a tradesman at Bury St. Edmund's, at the grammar-school of which town he and his brother, Dr. John Pretymán, the archdeacon of Lincoln, received the elements of their education; after which they removed to Cambridge. The bishop was distinguished at the university as a good classical scholar and expert arithmetician. Having the good fortune to become tutor to "the Heaven-born minister," he soon experienced the patronage of his pupil, who appointed him his private secretary, and gave him a prebendal stall in the church of St. Peter, Westminster. In 1787 he was made bishop of Lincoln, to which preferment was added the deanery of St. Paul's; and on the death of Dr. Randolph, he was offered the See of London, but that dignity he declined, from an expectation of something more substantial, in which calculation he was not disappointed; for, on the death of Brownlow North, he obtained the rich See of Winchester, the *summum bonum* of episcopal ambition.

Price, Morgan, *Knebworth*, r. *Letchworth*, r. R. W. Lytton. *Llan-gedwyn*, c. sir W. W. Wynne. *Tallachdu*, r. Parson Griffiths.

Proby, Charles, can. of Windsor; *Tachbrook Bishops*, v. Lichfield Cath. *Twickenham*, v. d. and can. of Windsor. *Waddesden*, 3rd Port, r. duke Marlborough.

Probyn, John, archdn. of Llandaff; *Abbenhall*, r. E. Probyn. *Ma-thern*, v. with *Caerwent*, v. archdn. of Llandaff.

Proctor, Joseph, D.D. preb. of Norwich; *Conington*, r. *Gidding Steeping*, r. J. Heathcote.

Prosser, Richard, D.D. preb. of Durham, archdn. of Durham, with *Easington*, r.

Radcliffe, John, *Doddington*, v. *Teynham*, v. archdn. of Cant. *Lime-house*, r. Brazenose Coll.

Ramsden, W. B. *Croxton All Saints*, v. Christ Coll. *Great Stam-bridge*, r. govts. of Charter House. *Little Wakering*, v. St. Bart. Hospital. *Witcham*, v. d. and c. of Ely.

Randolph, F. D.D. preb. of Bristol; *Banwell*, v. dn. and cns. of Bris-tol. *St. Paul, Covent Garden*, r. duke Bedford.

Proprietor of Laura chapel, Bath. The pluralist was appointed to instruct the duchess of York in English, to which circumstance he owes his preferments. He is also author of a Fast-day Sermon, and a pamphlet on the State of the Nation.

Randolph, J. H. preb. of St. Paul's; *Burton Coggles*, r. lord Chan. *Fobbing*, r. The King. *Nothall*, v. bp. of London.

Randolph, T. preb. of St. Paul's, and chap. to the King; *Great Had-ham*, r. and *Little Hadham*, c. bp. of London.

Raymond, Oliver. *Belchamp Walters*, v. with *Bulmer*, v. *Middle-ton*, r. Trustees of S. R. Raymond.

Rennell, Thomas, D.D. dn. of Winchester, preb. of St. Paul's. *Bar-ton Stacey*, v. dn. and ch. of Winton.

The prebend was resigned to Dr. Rennell, by his father, on his obtaining a fellowship in the university. Having obtained the patronage of the Grenvilles, he was presented to a living in the city, and, in 1798, was made master of the Temple. On the death of Dr. Holmes he was presented to the deanery of Win-chester. The dean married a daughter of judge Blackstone, by whom he has a son, who is also in the church. He was suspected of being concerned in a foolish book, called the *Pursuits of Literature*, but this charge he publicly dis-avowed. He is the author of several political sermons, one delivered in Win-

chester cathedral, in 1793, on the *Violence and Blood Guiltiness of the French Revolution*; another thanksgiving sermon for the success of his majesty's arms, preached before the Collective Wisdom, 1798. We mention these forgotten squibs, thinking they may afford a hint to spiritual aspirants, who may seek to avail themselves of passing events, by serving up *au rechauffé* the labours of the venerable dean.

Rice, hon. E. dn. of Gloucester, and precentor of York. *Great Risington*, r. lord Dynevor. *Oddington*, r. precentor of York.

Brother of lord Dynevor, and brother-in-law of the Markhams.

Richards, Charles, preb. of Winton. *Chale*; r. Incumbent. *Winchester*, *St. Bartholomew*, v. the King.

Richardson, J. vic. chor. of York. *Crambe*, v. *Hutton's Ambo*, p. c. abp. of York. *Fryston Ferry*, v. vic. chor. of York. *Heslington*, v. *Huntington*, v. York Cath.

Rodney, hon. Spencer, *New Romney*, v. All Souls Coll. *Swarraton*, r. A. Baring, M.P. *Wonstow*, v. T. Swineston.

Brother of lord Rodney, a pensioner; another brother vicar of Eye, of which the lord Chancellor is patron.

Roles, William, *Raunds*, v. *Upton Lovel*, r. *Sharncot*, r. lord Chan.

Rolfe, Robert, *Caldecot*, r. Mrs. Tynte. *Cockley Cley*, r. R. Dashwood. *Hempnall*, v. John T. Mott. *Yaxley*, r. *Thurgarton*, r. bp. of Norwich.

Rooke, George, *Wolford*, v. *with Burmington*, c. *Woolvercot*, c. Meriton Coll. *Yardley Hastings*, r. marquis Northampton.

Rowley, Joshua, *East Bergholt*, r. *with Brentham*, r. Incumbent. *Stoke by Nayland*, r. sir W. Rowley.

Royle, James, *Islington*, v. the King. *Stanfield*, r. rev. W. Newcome. *Wereham*, p. c. *with Wretton*, c. Edw. W. Pratt.

Rycroft, Henry, preb. of Lincoln. *Greetham*, r. *Mumby*, v. bp. of Lincoln.

Ryder, hon. Henry, D.D. bp. of Lichfield and Coventry, *with Pitchley*, r. annexed, dn. of Wells.

Brother of lord Harrowby, and uncle of lord Sandon, M.P. secretary to the India Board. The prelate was raised to the see of Gloucester on the translation of Huntingford to the neighbouring bishopric of Hereford, from which Luxmore had been removed to St. Asaph. It is necessary to attend to these translations, as they afford an important key in the disposal of patronage; the successive removes of bishops and dignitaries generally being indicated by trails of relations, left behind in possession of the most valuable preferments.

Sandiford, P., D.D. *Ashbury*, r. bp. of Bath. *Fulmodeston*, r. *with Croxton*, v. Corpus Christi Coll. *Newton in the Isle*, r. bp. of Ely.

Sargent, J. *Graffham*, r. *Woolavington*, r. *with Punton*, v. J. Sargent, esq.

Savory, Samuel H. *Barmer*, c. earl Oxford. *Houghton-in-the-Hole*, v. marquis Cholmondely. *Twyford*, r. G. Thomas.

Seale, J. B., D.D. *Anstye*, r. Camb. *Stisted*, r. abp. Cant. *Willingale Spain*, r. bp. of London.

Simms, W. Eratt, *Nayland*, c. sir W. Rowley. *Santon Downham*, p. c. lord Cadogan. *West Bergholt*, r. W. Fisher. *West Toft*, r. J. Moseley.

Simpson, T. *Boynton*, v. *Carnaby*, *Fraisthorpe*, c. sir G. Strickland. *Auborn*, p. c. dn. of York.

Singleton, Thomas, archdn. of Northumberland *with Elsdon*, r. annexed, preb. of Worcester.

Skurray, Francis, *Horningham*, p. and p. c. dn. of Sarum. *Lullington*, r. marq. Bath. *Winterbourne Abbas*, r. and *Steepleton*, r. Lincoln Coll. Oxon.

Slaney, Richard, *Kemberton*, r. *with Sutton Maddock*, v. P. Broughton. *Penkridge*, p. c. *with Coppenhall Hay*, c. *Dunston*, c. and *Woodbaston*, c. sir E. Lyttleton.

Sleath, John, D.D. head master of St. Paul's School, preb. of St. Paul's, and chaplain to the King.

As Dr. Sleath is high master of St. Paul's school, we cannot help adverting to a few abuses in the management by the Mercer's company of that munificent foundation of dean Colet. The landed revenues of the school amount to upwards of £6000 per annum; and by the aid of sundry outgoings in dinners, committees, pensions, repairs, gratuities, and medals, it is contrived that the expenditure shall nearly equal the income. It is now admitted, the charity was intended for all who could avail themselves of it, whether *rich or poor*; why then should the benefits of so wealthy a foundation, situated in the centre of the metropolis, be limited to the precise number of 153 scholars? The company are invested with full authority to modify the statutes of the school, as the changes of the times may require. When the number 153 was fixed, the income of the foundation was not one-fiftieth part of its present amount, and that number was fixed solely from a superstitious notion of the founder.*

But if the company are scrupulous about violating the ordinances of dean Colet, it is strange they have already violated so many. The dean ordained that, every morning, the children should be at the school by seven o'clock; that, thrice every day, prostrate, they should say their prayers; that, at Childermas-day they should "come to Paule Church and hear the *Childe Bishop's* sermon, and after be at the *high-mass*." Are these things observed?

The statutes of St. Paul's school are venerated in the same way, we suspect, as those of the colleges of Eton and Winchester; just as much of them is observed as suits the interest of those having the management, the rest is given to the winds. On this principle, the high-master's salary of a *mark a week* is interpreted to mean £613 per annum, besides gratuities; and the surmaster's salary of 6s. 8d. a week £300 per annum. From what part of the ordinances the annual gold medal to the accountant-surveyor, or the fee of one guinea for attendance on committees is derived, we have not been able to discover.

From the evidence of the high-master, Dr. Sleath, it appears, the children mostly belong to the clergy, the professional gentlemen, and medical men in the neighbourhood, and to gentlemen in Doctors' Commons. It has been suggested the instruction of the school should embrace reading, writing, and mathematics, but we have not heard this plan has been adopted. There certainly appears no just reason why the education of the school should be limited to the acquirement of Latin and Greek. Dean Colet contemplated no such restriction when he said, "*desiring nothyng more thanne EDUCATION and bringing uppe children in good manners and literature.*" Without deviating from the literal expression, education might be interpreted to include many other branches of knowledge beside an acquaintance with the learned languages.

The profusion in the expenditure of the school is wholly indefensible. There can be no doubt but the same number of boys might be taught Latin and Greek at a much less sum than was paid in pension to the late high-master; but it is

* Account of Public Charities, abridged from the Commissioners' Reports, with Notes and Comments, by the Editor of the "*Cabinet Lawyer*," p. 15.

mostly thus in foundations under the management of corporate bodies; no efforts to economize or to multiply the objects of the charity. If there be a surplus revenue it is sure to be exhausted in the expenses of committees, law-agency, and surveyors' charges; in extra repairs and improvements; in ostentatious buildings; in luxurious feasting for the parties and their friends; and in pensions and gratuities. There is never too much—generally too little, and the charity in debt.

Smith, S., D.D. dn of Christchurch, preb. of York. *Daventry*, p. c. *Dry Drayton*, r. Oxon.

Smith, Sydney, preb. of Bristol. *Foston*, r. lord Chan. *Londesboro'*, v. duke Devonshire.

Somerset, lord Wm. preb. of Bristol. *Crick Lowel*, r. *Llangattock*, r. *with Lonelly and Llangennett*, c. duke Beaufort.

Sparke, Bowyer Edward, D.D. bishop of Ely; consecrated bishop of Chester, 1809.

Sparke, J. H. preb. and chan. of diocese of Ely. *Leverington*, r. *with Parson Drove*, c. *Littlebury*, sinecure, r. bp. of Ely.

Son of the preceding; the father had the good fortune to become tutor to the duke of Rutland, and his advancement followed of course. From the deanery of Bristol he was raised to the see of Chester; and, on the death of Dr. Dampier, removed to the valuable see of Ely. Besides an immense revenue and numerous cathedral appointments, he has one hundred and eight livings in his gift. For an account of the preferments the rev. prelate has heaped on his family see p. 22.

Spooner, William, archdn. of Coventry, preb. of Lichfield. *Acle*, r. lord Calthorpe. *Elmdon*, r. L. Spooner.

Spry, J. Hume, D.D. preb. of Canterbury. *Hanbury*, v. bp. Lich. and Cov. *St. Marylebone*, r. the King.

The commissioners of woods and forests purchased of the duke of Portland the advowson of the opulent and populous parish of Mary-le-bone, out of the produce of the crown lands, for £40,000; this was considered less than the value, but his grace was content to make a sacrifice, rather than the patronage of so important a district should fall into the hands of dissenters.—See p. 125.

Stabback, William, *East Anstye*, r. corp. of Exeter. *St. Stephen*, r. bp. of Exeter. *Sancread*, v. dn. and ch. of Exon.

Stanhope, hon. F. H. R. *St. Buryan*, d. and r. *with St. Levan*, c. the King. *Cattan*, r. *Wressle*, v. lord Egremont.

Stawell, Wm. M. *Creacombe*, r. rev. W. Karslake. *Filleigh*, r. *with East Buckland*, r. earl Fortescue. *High-Bickington*, r. rev. W. Stawell.

Stevens, Robert, D.D. dn of Rochester, preb. of Lincoln. *West Farleigh*, v. dn and ch. of Rochester.

Stopford, hon. R. B. preb. of Hereford, can. of Windsor, chap. in ord. to H. M. *Barton Seagrave*, r. duke Buccleugh.

Strong, Philip, *Aston Abbots*, v. lord Chesterfield. *Colchester*, *St. Michael*, *Mile End*, r. *Myland*, r. countess de Grey.

Stubbin, N. J. *Higham*, v. *Offton*, r. *with Little Bricet*, c. *Somersham*, r. Trustees.

St. John, J. F. preb. of Worcester; *Chaddesden*, c. H. Gilbert. *Powick*, v. *Severnstoke*, r. lord Coventry. *Spondon*, v. *with Locker*, c. and *Standley*, c. D. W. Lowe.

Sumner, C. H. V. *Farmborough*, r. G. H. Sumner. *Newdigate*, r. lord Chan. *Newington Butts*, *Trinity*, c. rec. of Newington.

Sumner, Charles Rich. D.D. bishop of Winchester, prelate of the order of the garter, and visitor of Winchester College.

The right rev. prelate being visitor of Winchester College it may not be improper to call the attention of his lordship to the abuses which have crept into the foundation, and which in the exercise of his power of inspection and superintendence he may have authority to reform. The college was founded by William of Wykham, in the fourteenth century, and, like that of Eton, intended for the education of seventy "poor and indigent scholars." So careful was the founder to confine the benefits of his institution entirely to the *poor*, that the boys, when they attain the age of fifteen, solemnly swear they have not *three pounds six shillings* a year to spend; and it is expressly ordered, if ever any scholar come into the possession of property to the amount of five pounds a year, he shall be expelled. The management of the college is vested in the warden, the bishop of Hereford, and ten reverend divines, termed "fellows," subject to the visitation of the bishop of Winchester. The warden, fellows, and scholars, all swear to observe the statutes, "according to their plain, literal, grammatical sense and understanding." Peculiar privileges are secured to the founder's kin, ten or twelve of whom were lately upon the foundation. The revenue of the college amounts to about £14,000, and the expenditure to £11,000. The value of a fellowship, according to the evidence of Mr. Williams, is four or five hundred pounds a year, with meat and drink gratis in the college; also the use of knives, forks, plates, and as many church livings as they can obtain. The emoluments of a warden are double those of a fellow, with travelling expenses, &c. The scholars are chosen yearly, by six electors; their ordinary fare is bread and butter to breakfast; beef, bread, and cheese to dinner; mutton, bread, and cheese to supper, with beer at every meal. They have no spoons, knives, nor forks, nor vegetables of any sort, *allowed by the statutes*, but they have salt and wooden trenchers found, and one gown is given annually to each scholar for clothing. The allowance for the sustentation of the boys, may be varied agreeably to the statutes, according to the price of corn and provisions.

Such we collect from the Third Report of the Education Committee, to be the history and nature of this foundation, which has been very strangely perverted and abused. First, instead of the scholars being "poor and indigent," they are all children of *opulent persons*; some, we suspect, of noble families, who, at the time they solemnly swear they have not *three pounds six shillings* a year to spend, are paying ten guineas a year to the masters, and the average of their other expenses exceeds fifty. By a liberal translation of the warden, who has sworn to observe the statutes according to their *literal and grammatical sense*, *one hundred shillings* are considered equal to £66 : 13 : 4. It is strictly enjoined that no boy shall be admitted above twelve years of age. This is wholly disregarded. The incomes of the fellowships are augmented to four or five hundred pounds a year, by a liberal interpretation of the term describing their money payments; while the strictest construction is adopted towards the scholars and founder's kin; the latter continuing only to receive their old statutable allowance of *forty shillings a year*. Thus, too, while the scholars are refused the convenience of knives, forks, spoons, plates, &c. on the grounds that such articles of furniture were unknown in the time of William of Wykham, the fellows are allowed those accommodations, although the fellowships were endowed at the same early period. That a surplus revenue of three or four thousand pounds may be divided betwixt the warden and fellows, the parents of the scholars pay between sixty and seventy pounds a year for their education; although it was intended by the founder they should be instructed and maintained gratuitously.

During the inquiries of the Education Committee, a singular sort of delicacy was manifested by the heads of this college to screen the abuse of the institution from investigation. They affected to be extremely willing to give every possible information relative to the college; but unfortunately they had sworn, conformably to the statutes, not to disclose the *private affairs* of the college; and until their scruples relative to this *moral and religious obligation* were removed, they

could not, forsooth, submit their concerns to the investigation of the committee. Now, this would have been all well enough, had it not been notorious that the warden and fellows, on every occasion, when it suited their interest, had shown the greatest contempt both for the oaths and ordinances of the founder; nay, with so little respect had these precious relics been treated by the reverend hypocrites, who affected to be suddenly seized with a profound veneration for them, that they had been left exposed to the boys of the school, who scrawled upon them whatever nonsense they pleased. But the truth is, they wished to avoid inquiry,—as well they might; and they attempted to play off the same artifice on the committee, in the construction of the statutes, which enabled them to deprive the scholars of knives, forks, vegetables, and the kinsmen of the founder of their yearly incomes.

Sumner, John Bird, D.D. bishop of Chester, *with Waverton*, r. annexed, preb. of Durham.

Surtees, J. preb. of Bristol; *Banham*, r. The King. *Bristol*, St. Augustine, v. and St. Mark, c. lord Chanc. *Taverham*, 1st and 2d Mediety, r. bp. Norwich and Mrs. Branthwayte alt.

Brother-in-law of lord Eldon. For another brother-in-law of the ex-chancellor see M. V. Surtees, *List of Places*.

Sutton, Charles, D.D. *Aldeburgh*, r. duke Norfolk. *Holme* (near the Sea) v. *with Bishops Thornham*, v. bp. of Norwich. *Norwich*, St. Geo. Tombla, r. bp. of Ely.

Sutton, E. L. one of the six preach. of Canterbury; *High Halden*, r. St. Peter's, v. abp. of Cant.

Sutton, Robert, preb. of Ripon; *Falford*, c. York, St. Michael in Spurrier Gate, alias St. Michael at Ousebridge, r. lord Chanc.

Sutton, T. M. preb. of Westminster; *Great Chart*, r. Tunstall, r. abp. of Cant.

Other Suttons are in the church, with one or two livings. Most of them, but we cannot discover how many, are related to the late primate Sutton, whose mode of disposing of church patronage has been described, page 23. The archbishop, like many other noble persons, was indebted for his education to the Charter House, which opulent foundation was intended only for the "maintenance and education of POORE CHILDREN," and "the relief of poore, fatherless, decrepit, aged, sick, infirm, and impotent persons." On entering holy orders his grace obtained some ecclesiastical preferment, and soon after, by his affinity to the Rutland family, was raised to the See of Norwich, with which dignity he was permitted to hold the deanery of Windsor. On the death of archbishop Moore, in 1804, his lordship, by the special favour of George III., was elevated to the primacy. It is observable that a short time before the following panegyric on his grace appeared in the *Pursuits of Literature*, a work ascribed to Mr. Mathias, privy clerk to queen Charlotte:—"He is a prelate whose amiable demeanour, useful learning, and conciliating habits of life, particularly recommend his episcopal character. No man appears to me so peculiarly marked out for the highest dignity of the church, *sede vacante*, as Dr. SUTTON." This puff direct, and the writer, availing himself of those opportunities which his situation afforded, is supposed to have materially contributed to the sudden exaltation of the archbishop. The patronage of the archbishopric is 131 livings, an archdeaconry, and three prebends. Out of this fund his grace was enabled to provide comfortably for his numerous offspring.

Swainson, C. preb. of Hereford; *Clunn*, v. *with Bettws*, c. *Edgton*, c. *Llanvair Waterdine*, c. and *Shipton*, c. earl Powis.

Swan, Francis, *Kirton*, v. *with Brothertoft*, c. Mercers' Comp. Lond. *Lincoln*, St. Pet. Arc. r. and at *Goats*, p.c. Prebendary. *Winterringham*, r. rev. J. L. Saville.

- Tanqueray, Edward, *Ridgmont*, v. Sequest. *Tampsford*, r. the King. *Tingrith*, r. Mr. Treven.
- Taylor, C. D.D. preb. of Hereford and chanc. of the dio. Hereford; *Madley*, v. with *Tibberton*, c. *Stanton*, *St. Michael*, v. dn. and ch. Hereford.
- Templer, G. H. preb. of Wells; *Shapwick*, v. Incumbent. *Thornford*, r. Mrs. Sampson.
- Tennyson, G. D.D. *Benningworth*, r. R. Ainstie. *Great Grimsby*, *St. James*, v. and *St. Mary*, v. G. R. Heneage. *Somersby*, r. R. Burton.
- Thackeray, J. R. *Downham Market*, r. Miss Franks. *Hadley*, d. J. Penny. *Wiggenhall*, *St. Mary Magdalen*, v. Mrs. Gorforth.
- Thompson, John B. *Luddesdown*, r. rev. Dr. R. Thompson. *Shrop-ham*, v. Corp. of Norwich. *Thompson*, c. S. Hethersett.
- Thornhill, John, *Cockfield*, r. *Staindrop*, r. marquis Cleveland. *Middleton in Teesdale*, r. the King.
- Thurlow, Edward S. preb. of Norwich; *Eastwn*, r. *Stamfordham*, v. lord Chanc. *Houghton-le-Spring*, r. bp. of Durham.
- Three more Thurlows in the church, one a pluralist. *Houghton-le-Spring*, next to *Brentford*, is the highest valuation in the king's book, and rated at £124. The pedigree of these preferments will be seen by refering to Thurlow in our *Place List*.
- Thynne, lord John, sub-dn. and can. res. of Lincoln; *Kingston Deverill*, r. *Street*, r. with *Walton*, c. marquis Bath.
- Third son of the patron and son-in-law of the rev. C. C. Beresford.
- Tickell, John A. *Castle Acre*, v. T. W. Coke. *Hempstead*, near *Holt*, v. *Wighton*, v. dn. and ch. of Norwich.
- Timbrill, J. D.D. archdn. of Gloucester, with *Dursley*, r. annexed, *Beckford*, v. with *Alston Underhill*, c. *Bradforton*, v. with *Aldington*, c. rev. Dr. Timbrell.
- Tredcroft, Robert, preb. of Chichester; *Fittleworth*, v. bp. of Chichester. *Tangmere*, r. duke Richmond. *West Ichenor*, r. lord Chanc.
- Trevelyan, Walter, preb. of Wells; *Henbury*, v. with *Aust*, c. and *Northwick*, c. lord Middleton. *Nettlecombe*, r. sir J. Trevelyan.
- Treweeke, George, *Illogan*, r. lord de Dunstanville. *Manselgamage*, v. *St. Menver*, v. sir J. G. Cotterell.
- Trivett, W. *Arlington*, v. *Willingdon*, r. Chichester Cath. *Ashburnham*, with *Penshurst*, r. dn. and ch. of Cant. *Bradwell*, r. The King.
- Turner, Richard, preb. of Lincoln; *Great Yarmouth*, p. c. dn. and ch. of Norwich. *Ormesby*, *St. Margaret*, v. and *St. Michael*, v. with *Scroteby*, c. *Swelling*, r. Incumbent.
- Turner, Samuel, *Attenborough*, v. with *Bramcote*, r. F. Foljambe. *Nettleton*, r. rev. W. Jackson. *Rothwell*, r. lord Middleton. *Tealby*, v. G. Tennyson.
- Turton, Thomas, D.D. preb. of Lincoln, reg. prof. of div. Cambridge. *Somersham*, r. with *Coln St. Helen*, c. and *Pidley*, c. annexed. *Gimmingham*, r. with *Trunch*, r. Cath. Hall, Camb.

- Underwood, T. can. rps. of Hereford. *Lugwardine*, v. with *Bartestry*, c. *Dewchurch*, c. *Hentland*, c. *Langarrow*, c. and *St. Veep Wennard*, c. dn. and ch. of Hereford. *Ross*, r. and v. bp. of Hereford.
- Van Mildert, W., D.D. bishop of Durham and custos rotulorum.
- Vansittart, W., D.D. preb. of Carlisle, master of Wigston's Hosp. Leicester. *Waltham Abbas*, v. with *Shottesbrook*, r. A. Vansittart.
- Vernon, hon. Edward Venables, D.C.L. archbishop of York.
- Vernon, hon. J. S. V. preb. of Southwell. *Barton in Fabis*, r. abp. of York.
- Vernon, L. V. chanc. of the church of York, archdn. of Cleveland. *Kirby in Cleveland*, sinecure, r. *Stainton*, *St. Winifrid*, v. *Stokesley*, r. abp. of York.
- Vernon, W. Venables, can. res. of York. *Etton*, r. *Wheldrake*, r. abp. of York.
- Six more Vernons, with valuable preferments. They belong to the family of the archbishop of York. The Venables are also relations of the archbishop. The right rev. prelate is the younger son of the late lord Vernon by his third wife, the sister of the first lord Harcourt. He married a sister of the marquis of Stafford, by whom he has several children, all well provided in church and state. The first preferment of the bishop was a canonry in Christchurch; he was next advanced to the bishopric of Carlisle, on the removal of Douglas to Salisbury; and, in 1807, he succeeded Markham in the see of York. The patroage of his grace is 80 livings, 50 prebends, besides precentorships and sub-deaconries.
- Vevers, Richard, *Saxby*, r. lord Harborough. *Stoke Albany*, r. *Wilbarston*, v. lord Sondes.
- Vevers, R. W. *Coates*, v. sequestrated. *Marton*, v. bp. of Lincoln. *Somershall*, r. lord Chesterfield.
- Vincent, Wm. preb. of Chichester, *London*, *Allhallows*, *Great and Less*, r. abp. of Cant.
- Son of the late Dr. Vincent, head-master of Westminster school, dean of Westminster, King's chaplain, and rector of Allhallows. The son has apparently succeeded to most of his father's preferments. The doctor was patronized by lord Sidmouth, from whom he received a prebend in the collegiate church of Westminster. He preached and published several *loyal sermons*, which were carefully distributed by the Association for the "Protection of Property," at the Crown and Anchor Tavern.
- Vivian, J. W., D.D. min. can. of St. Paul's. *London*, *St. Austin and St. Faith*, r. *Mucking*, v. dn. and ch. of St. Paul's.
- Wakeham, H. *Culford*, r. with *Ingham*, r. and *Timworth*, r. bp. of Lich. and Cov.
- Walker, A. J. *Bishops Stone*, r. *Llangua*, r. *Yazer*, v. U. Price.
- Ward, Wm. D.D. bishop of Sodor and Man, preb. of Sarum. *Great Horkesley*, r. countess de Grey.
- Warneford, S. W., D.D. *Burton on the Hill*, r. with *Moreton in Marsh*, c. and *Lower Slaughter*, c. *Liddiard Millicent*, r. rev. Dr. Warneford.
- Walpole, Robert, *Itteringham*, r. with *Mannington*, r. lord Orford. *St. Mary-le-bone*, *Christchurch*, d. r. the King.

Watson, J. J., D.D. archdn. of St. Alban's, preb. of St. Paul's. *Digs-well*, r. Incumbent. *Hackney*, r. S. Tyssen.

Watson, Richard, preb. of Wells and Llandaff. *Dingestow*, v. with *Tregan*, c. arch. and ch. Llandaff. *Penrice*, v. *Undy*, v. bp. Llandaff.

Watson, Robert, *Barlavington*, r. *South Bradon*, sinecure, r. lord Egremont. *Egdean*, r. *Hardham*, r. sir C. F. Goring.

These Watsons are relicts of the late Dr. Watson, bishop of Landaff, arch-deacon of Ely, rector of Knoptoft, professor of divinity in Cambridge, with the rectory of Somersham, in Huntingdonshire, annexed. The bishop had been tutor to the late duke of Rutland, who gave him the rectory of Knoptoft, and next exerted his influence for his advancement to the bishopric of Landaff. Here the prelate became stationary: his politics did not exactly accord with the Toryism of George III., and the doctrines advanced by him in the American war and during the French Revolution, prevented his translation to a richer see. Neither his ambition nor cupidity, however, appear to have been less than those of his brethren. In the *Posthumous Memoirs*, published by his son, he complains bitterly that his "public services" had not been sufficiently rewarded, though possessed of the numerous preferments mentioned. He also declaims lustily against the statesmen of his time, declaring that they "sacrificed their public principles to private ends, and their honour to their ambition," and that their "patriotism was merely a selfish struggle for power." In the latter opinions all men now coincide, unless those blinded by prejudice or personal attachment.

Webb, Richard, min. can. of St. Paul's, Westminster, and Windsor. *Kensworth*, v. dn. and can. of St. Paul's.

One might exhibit a curious and authentic account of the private history of this minor canon of three churches; but we wish to avoid all *personal* details relative to the clergy. First, because to enter into the private history of the clergy would far exceed our limits. Secondly, because we had not materials for so doing, unless we chose to rely on reports and statements which we had no means of verifying. Lastly, and this is our principal reason, the best authenticated private details serve only to expose individuals, not the system; whereas our object has constantly been to expose the system, not the individuals composing it.

Webber, Charles, archdn. and can. res. of Chichester. *Amport*, v. with *Appleshaw*, c. dn. and ch. of Chichester.

Webber, E. *Bathealton*, r. bp. of Bath. *Runnington*, r. the King. *Thorne*, *St. Margaret*, c. archdn. of Taunton.

Webber, James, preb. of Westminster, dn. of Ripon. *Kirkham*, v. Christ Church, Oxon, *Westminster*, *St. Marg.* r. dn. and ch. of Westminster.

Welby, John Earle. *Haceby*, r. W. G. Welby. *Harston*, r. the King. *Stroxton*, r. sir J. E. Welby. *West Allington*, r. dn. and ch. of Exon.

Welfitt, William, D.D. preb. of Canterbury. *Elmstead*, v. *Hasting-leigh*, r. abp. of Cant. *Ticehurst*, v. dn. and ch. of Cant.

Wellesley, hon. G. V., D.D. preb. of Durham, chap in ord. to H. M. *Bishop's Wearmouth*, r. bp. of Durham. *Chelsea*, r. lord Cadogan. *Therfield*, r. dn. and ch. of St. Paul's.

Son of the countess of Mornington, and brother of lady Ann Culling Smith, and the duke of Wellington, whom see in our *Place List*.

Wells, George, preb. of Chichester. *Billinghurst*, v. Sir H. Goring. *Wiston*, r. C. Goring.

- Westcombe, Thomas, min. can. of Winton. *Preston, Candover*, v. *with Nutley*, c. dn. and ch. of Winton, *Winchester, St. Peter Stoke*, r. *with St. John*, r. lord Chan.
- Weston, C. F. *Melton Ross*, p. c. Prebendary. *Ruckland*, r. *with Farforth*, r. and *Marden Well*, c. lord Yarborough. *Somerby*, r. *with Bagenderby*, r. the King.
- Wetherell, Henry, archdn. of Hereford and preb. of Gloucester. *Kentchurch*, r. the King. *Kingstone*, v. dn. of Hereford.
- Whichcote, Francis, *Aswardby*, r. *Deeping, St. James*, v. *Swarby*, v. sir T. Whichcote.
- Whinfield, H. *Battlesdon*, r. *with Potsgrove*, r. sir G. P. Turner. *Tyringham*, r. *with Filgrave*, r. Wm. Praed.
- Whalley, R. T. preb. of Wells. *Ilchester*, r. *Yeovilton*, r. bp of Bath.
- Whistler, W. W. *Hastings, All Saints*, r. and *St. Clements*, r. sir G. Webster, *Newtimber*, r. N. Newnham.
- Whitcombe, Francis, *Ferring*, v. Prebendary. *Lodsworth*, c. S. W. Poyntz. *Stanlake*, r. Magdalen Coll.
- White, Henry, vic. of Lichfield Cath. *Chebsea*, v. *Dilhorn*, v. *Ridware Pipe*, c. dn. and ch. of Lichfield.
- Whittingham, Paul, min. can. of Norwich. *Martham*, v. *Norwich, St. Saviour*, r. *Sedgford*, v. dn. and ch. of Norwich.
- Wickham, Thomas, preb. of Sarum. *North Newington*, v. *with Little Knoyle*, c. preb. of Sarum Cath. *Yatton*, v. *with Kenn*, c. preb. of Yatton.
- Wilkins, G., D.D. preb. of Southwell. *Lowdham*, v. *Nottingham, St. Mary*, v. and *St. Paul*, c. *Snenton*, p. c. Earl Manvers. *Wing*, r. lord Chan.
- Wilkinson, W. F. *East Harling*, r. W. F. Wilkinson. *North Walsham*, v. *with Antingham, St. Margaret*, r. Queen's Coll. Cam. *Norwich, St. Benedict*, c. and *St. Laurence*, r. Parishioners.
- Wilkinson, M. W. *Harescombe*, r. *with Pitchcombe*, r. Mrs. Parnell. *Redgrave*, r. G. St. Wilson. *Uley*, r. lord Chan.
- Willoughby, H. P. *Birtherpe*, r. *Burythorpe*, c. lord Chan.
- Wingfield, Thomas, *Stapleford*, v. *Teigh*, r. lord Harborough, *Tickencote*, r. J. Wingfield.
- Wintle, Robert, preb. of St. Paul's. *Compton Beauchamp*, r. Mr. Wright. *Culham*, v. bp. of Oxford.
- Wodehouse, hon. A. *Bixton*, r. *East and West Lexham*, r. *with Litchans*, r. *Kimberley*, v. *with Barnham Broom*, r. lord Wodehouse.
- Wodehouse, C. N. preb. of Norwich. *Geldestone*, r. lord Chan. *Murningthorpe*, r. the King.
- Wodehouse, Thomas, can. res. of Wells. *Norton*, r. *Stourmouth*, r. bp. of Rochester.
- Wodehouse, hon. W. *Carlton Forehoe*, r. lord Wodehouse. *Hingham*, r. *Falmouth*, r. hon. and rev. W. Wodehouse.

The hon. and rev. A. Wodehouse, who has four rectories and a vicarage, is the son of lord Wodehouse, the patron, and son-in-law of sir T. Beauchamp-Proctor. W. Wodehouse is another son of the noble lord. Several more of the

- family are well provided in church or state, but a notice of them does not belong to our present subject.
- Wollen, W., D.D. *Bridgewater*, v. *with Chilton Trinity*, r. *Kilton*, v. the King.
- Wood, George, *Cann. St. Rumbold*, r. *Dorchester, Trinity*, v. *Shaftesbury, St. Rumbold*, r. lord Shaftesbury.
- Wood, J., D.D. dean of Ely. *Freshwater*, r. St. John's Coll. Camb.
- Wood, Peter, preb. of Chichester. *Broadwater*, r. *Rusper*, r. Mr. Wood.
- Worsley, Ralph, sub-dean of Ripon. *Finchley*, r. bp. of London. *Little Ponton*, r. rev. Dr. Dowdeswell.
- Woodcock, H. preb. of Sarum, can. of Christ Church. *Longparish, or Middleton Prebend*, lady Churchill. *Michaelmarsh*, r. bp. of Winton.
- Woodward, W. P. preb. of Chichester. *Plumpton*, r. Mrs. Woodward. *West Grinstead*, r. Mr. Woodward.
- Woolcombe, Henry, *Ashbury*, r. the King. *High Hampton*, r. J. M. Woolcombe. *Pillaton*, r. W. Helgar.
- Worsley, H., D.D. *Gatcomb*, r. Mr. Campbell. *St. Lawrence*, r. hon. C. A. Pelham, *Woolverton*, r. Messrs. R. and J. Clarke.
- Wrangham, Francis, archdn. of East Riding of York and preb. of York and Chester. *Dodleston*, r. dn. and ch. of Chester. *Hunmanby*, v. *with Fordon*, c. *Muston*, v. H. S. Osbaldeston.
- Wrench, J. G., D.C.L. *Blakeney*, c. Haberdashers' Comp. London. *Salehurst*, v. S. Micklethwait. *Stowting*, r. rev. Dr. Wrench.
- Wrey, B. W. *Combintenhead*, r. *Tawstock*, r. *Temple Imp.* c. sir B. Wrey.
- Wright, Thomas, *East Claydon*, v. *Middle*, r. *and Steeple*, v. Mr. Vacknell.
- Wyndham, T. T., D.D. *Hinton Admiral*, p. c. G. J. Topps. *Melcombe*, r. *with Radipole*, c. W. Wyndham. *Pimperne*, r. lord Rivers.
- Yonge, Denys, *East Anthony*, v. R. Carewe. *West Putford*, r. lord Clinton. *Willoughton*, v. King's Coll. and lord Scarborough, alt.
- Yonge, James, *Cockington*, c. *Tormoham*, c. rev. R. Mallock. *Stockley Pomeroy*, r. bp. of Exeter.
- Yonge, William, Chan. of d. of Norwich. *Hillburgh*, r. earl Nelson. *Swaffham*, v. *with Threxton*, r. bp. of Norwich.
- Several more *Yonges* in the church. They are, by marriage, relations of earl Nelson, prebendary of Canterbury, and a pensioner to the amount of £5000 per annum.

VALUATION OF SEES AND DIGNITIES IN THE KING'S BOOK.

THE only authentic return of the amount of church revenues is the *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, of the time of Henry VIII. This document is incomplete even for the period it was obtained, many deaneries and ecclesiastical dignities having been

omitted ; and it is still less applicable to the present, owing to the vast alteration in the value of land and tithe. Still it is the only authentic basis for estimating the value of sees and dignities ; and, aided by information from other sources, we may form an estimate of the incomes of the bishops, deans, archdeacons, precentors, chancellors, and other cathedral officials.

Last session of parliament Dr. Lushington admitted the income of the See of Canterbury amounted to £32,000, and the bishop of London admitted his income amounted to about £15,000. Thus it appears from the subjoined table of the valuations in *Liber Regis* that these sees have increased in value twelve and fourteen fold. The revenues of other sees and dignities being derived from sources similar to those of Canterbury and London, the incomes of any of the bishoprics, dignities, and offices in the subjoined statement may be calculated to have augmented in a similar ratio.

But we are convinced that ecclesiastical property throughout the kingdom has generally augmented in a much higher proportion than fourteen to one, and for proof of this we appeal to the results of the inquiries of the education committee and of the charity commissioners. St. Paul's school is an appropriate example of the vast increase in the value of land ; the estates of this foundation are situated in various districts of England ; in A.D. 1524, they produced an income of £122 : 0 : 11 ; in the year 1820, the yearly income derived from the same estates amounted to £5252 : 2 : 11½. Here is an increase in value of nearly *fifty fold*, under the wasteful and negligent management of a city company. The colleges of Eton and Winchester were endowed for the education and maintenance of only *seventy poor and indigent scholars* ; their revenues amount respectively to £10,000 and £14,000 a year. The founder of Hemsworth's hospital, in Yorkshire, estimated its revenues not to exceed £70 a year ; they are now more than £2000. Leed's grammar-school was endowed in the reign of Philip and Mary, for the maintenance of two masters, and the endowments probably calculated to yield £80 a year ; they now produce £1595. Birmingham grammar-school has a revenue of near £5000 per annum. The valuation of the rectory of Alresford in the king's book is only £8 a year ; the composition now paid for tithes by the parishioners is £300 per annum, being an increase of more than thirty-seven fold. The rectory of Stanhope, Durham county, Mr. Phillpotts admits to yield an income of £2500 ; the valuation in *Liber Regis* is £67 : 6 : 8. Ilfracombe, in Devonshire, is returned at £50 : 4 : 4 ; the tithes are leased to a layman and worth £1000 a year. The tithes of the adjoining parish of Morthoe are also leased out to a layman for £700 or £800, although the valuation in the King's Book is only £19 : 19 : 3. Besides affording a curious illustration of the increase in the value of ecclesiastical property, we may observe, in passing, that the two last mentioned parishes are a curious example of the state of church discipline. Ilfracombe is attached to a prebendal stall of Salisbury 120 miles distant ; Morthoe belongs to the dean and canons of Exeter ; although the tithes are so considerable the working minister of each parish receives only a stipend of £100 a year. In Morthoe the glebe is also leased out,—the vicar having no

residence, lives five or six miles off, and service is performed *once* on Sunday, which is all the return the parishioners receive for their tithe-assessment of £800 per annum.

We might cite other facts to illustrate the increase in the value of church property since the ecclesiastical survey of the sixteenth century; but we consider the examples we have selected from various parts of the kingdom sufficient, and shall leave the reader to adopt from them such a proportion as he deems most equitable for estimating the present worth of the subjoined incomes. If churchmen demur to such mode of procedure, our reply is—let us have an authentic and authorized return of their emoluments. Till then we have a right to rely on collateral and inferential evidence.

Canterbury :

Archbishop	£2682	12	0
Archdeacon	163	1	10

York :

Archbishop	1610	0	0
Dean	308	10	7
Chancellor of the church	85	6	8
Precentor	96	4	6
Sub-dean	50	14	2
Archdeacon of York	90	3	1
Archdeacon of Nottingham	61	0	10
Archdeacon of East Riding	62	14	7
Archdeacon of Cleveland	36	0	10

London :

Bishop	1000	0	0
Dean	220	15	0
Chancellor of St. Paul's..	33	0	0
Precentor of do.	46	7	6
Treasurer of do.	37	0	0
Archdeacon of Middlesex	60	0	0
Archdeacon of London ..	23	13	0
Archdeacon of Essex....	52	0	0
Archdeacon of Colchester	50	0	0

Durham :

Bishop	1821	0	0
Archdeacon of Durham..	100	0	0
Archdeacon of Northum- berland	36	13	0

Winchester :

Bishop	2873	18	1
Archdeacon of Surrey ..	91	3	6
Archdeacon of Winchester	67	15	2

Bangor :

Bishop	238	16	1
--------------	-----	----	---

Dean	£22	17	3
Chancellor of the church	0	3	4

Bath and Wells :

Bishop	533	1	3
Dean	121	7	6
Sub-dean	21	15	7
Chancellor of the church	40	5	0
Precentor	24	6	3
Treasurer	62	2	3
Archdeacon of Wells....	144	2	11
Archdeacon of Bath	25	15	0
Archdeacon of Taunton..	83	7	6

Bristol :

Bishop	327	5	7
Archdeacon of Dorset ..	82	12	8

Carlisle :

Bishop	420	13	3
--------------	-----	----	---

Chester :

Bishop	420	0	0
--------------	-----	---	---

Chichester :

Bishop	677	5	3
Dean	58	9	4
Precentor	35	0	10
Chancellor of the church	27	7	1
Treasurer	62	6	8
Archdeacon of Chichester	38	3	4
Archdeacon of Lewes....	39	15	0

Ely :

Bishop	2134	18	0
Archdeacon	97	5	2

Exeter :

Bishop	500	0	0
Dean	158	0	0

Præcentor	£99	13	4	Archdeacon	£32	12	8
Treasurer	32	17	3	Treasurer	12	2	11
Sub-dean	22	10	0	Chancellor of the church	2	13	9
Archdeacon of Exeter ..	60	15	10	Precentor	6	0	0
Archdeacon of Totness ..	37	19	7				
Archdeacon of Barnstaple	49	0	0				
Archdeacon of Cornwall	50	6	5				

Gloucester :

Bishop	315	17	8				
Archdeacon	64	10	0				

Hereford :

Bishop	768	11	0				
Dean	38	6	3				
Chancellor of the church	14	3	4				
Precentor	21	9	7				
Treasurer	9	10	10				
Archdeacon of Salop	32	10	10				
Archdeacon of Hereford	41	17	10				

Lichfield and Coventry :

Bishop	559	17	3				
Dean of Lichfield	40	0	0				
Precentor	40	0	0				
Chancellor	40	13	1				
Treasurer of Sawley	56	13	4				
Treasurer of Treeford ..	34	0	0				
Treasurer of Pip a Mina	30	0	0				
Treasurer of Flixton	23	0	0				
Archdeacon of Stafford ..	30	16	10				
Archdeacon of Derby	26	13	4				
Archdeacon of Coventry	45	9	2				
Archdeacon of Salop	19	0	0				

Lincoln :

Bishop	824	0	0				
Dean	203	9	7				
Archdeacon of Leicester	87	19	2				
Archdeacon of Lincoln ..	179	19	2				
Archdeacon of Bedford ..	60	12	3				
Archdeacon of Stow	25	17	8				
Archdeacon of Bucks ..	87	14	7				
Archdeacon of Hants ..	64	14	2				
Precentor	40	13	8				
Chancellor of the church	42	7	4				
Sub-dean	2	8	4				

Mlandaff :

Bishop	154	14	2				
--------------	-----	----	---	--	--	--	--

Norwich :

Bishop	834	11	7				
Archdeacon of Norfolk ..	143	8	4				
Archdeacon of Norwich ..	71	1	3				
Archdeacon of Suffolk ..	89	2	11				
Archdeacon of Sudbury ..	76	9	4				

Oxford :

Bishop	381	11	0				
Archdeacon	71	6	0				

Peterborough :

Bishop	414	17	8				
Archdn. of Northampton	122	7	1				

Rochester :

Bishop	358	14	6				
Archdeacon	34	14	9				

Salisbury :

Bishop	1335	5	0				
Dean and canon res.	204	10	0				
Precentor	69	6	8				
Chancellor of the church	56	6	10				
Treasurer	101	3	1				
Archdeacon of Berks	54	18	6				
Archdeacon of Sarum ..	70	11	8				
Archdeacon of Wilts	64	18	9				

St. Asaph :

Bishop	262	6	7				
Dean	45	11	5				
Chancellor	37	13	4				
Precentor	40	0	0				
Treasurer	18	6	8				

St. David's :

Bishop	426	2	1				
Precentor	20	6	10				
Chancellor of the church	17	17	1				
Treasurer	24	18	6				

Worcester :

Bishop	929	13	3				
Archdeacon	58	10	0				

CHURCH OF IRELAND.

IN concluding our article on this subject, we purposed subjoining, in the APPENDIX, a list of Irish Pluralists; this intention we have determined to forego, for two reasons; first, because we are unable to do it with perfect accuracy and completeness, not having the means for ascertaining with certainty the dignities and offices held by Irish Pluralists, as well as benefices; secondly, in considering what we have said on the Irish Church, we think so full an exposition has been given of episcopal revenues, see-lands, unions, discipline, numbers of the clergy, tithes, compositions, patronage, and other matters connected therewith, that any further illustration of the Protestant establishment of Ireland would be almost superfluous, and augment the size of our publication, without corresponding advantage.

Our statements of the number of parishes that had compounded for tithes, at pages 90 and 94, were drawn from the returns laid before parliament in 1828; we subjoin the results of the subsequent returns of the session 1830. By comparing the returns, it will be seen, that in the interval 202 additional parishes had compounded, leaving 1097 parishes to compound.

Number of Parishes which have compounded for Tithes in Ireland, the Amount of Composition, and the Proportion of Lay and Ecclesiastical Tithes.

[In the succeeding statements shillings and pence are mostly omitted.]

	Parishes.	Lay Tithes. £	Clerical Tithes. £	Compo- sition. £
PROVINCE OF ARMAGH.				
Armagh	48 ..	— ..	19,292 ..	19,292
Clogher	28 ..	1,291 ..	12,257 ..	13,548
Meath	137 ..	11,212 ..	21,406 ..	32,618
Down and Connor	40 ..	1,439 ..	13,622 ..	15,061
Derry	42 ..	— ..	22,990 ..	22,990
Raphoe	14 ..	352 ..	7,424 ..	7,777
Kilmore	19 ..	874 ..	4,813 ..	5,688
Dromore	9 ..	2,128 ..	2,647 ..	4,775
Ardagh	21 ..	2,303 ..	4,793 ..	7,097
PROVINCE OF DUBLIN.				
Dublin	91 ..	4,031 ..	15,035 ..	19,066
Kildare	36 ..	2,089 ..	7,363 ..	9,452
Ossory	61 ..	1,550 ..	15,557 ..	17,107
Ferns and Leighlin	103 ..	7,181 ..	27,989 ..	35,170
PROVINCE OF CASHEL.				
Cashel and Emly	93 ..	5,083 ..	19,555 ..	24,638
Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe	128 ..	7,016 ..	24,349 ..	31,366
Waterford and Lismore	52 ..	2,386 ..	12,500 ..	14,886
Cork and Ross	65 ..	4,022 ..	23,282 ..	27,305
Cloyne	57 ..	4,345 ..	18,629 ..	22,975
Killaloe and Kilfenora	121 ..	3,676 ..	23,355 ..	27,032
PROVINCE OF TUAM.				
Tuam	60 ..	2,945 ..	11,450 ..	14,396
Elphin	54 ..	2,377 ..	6,817 ..	9,194
Clonfert and Kilmacduagh	59 ..	86 ..	8,636 ..	8,723
Killala and Achonry	15 ..	1,098 ..	2,593 ..	3,691
TOTAL.....	1,353	67,494	326,363	393,857

CIVIL LIST.

No. 1.

Expenditure in the Department of the Lord Steward of his late Majesty's Household.—*Parl. Paper*, No. 17, Sess. 1830.

	1820. £	1823. £	1826. £	1829. £
Bread	1,422 ..	1,377 ..	1,946 ..	2,565
Butter, Bacon, Cheese, and Eggs	2,405 ..	2,507 ..	4,264 ..	4,269
Vegetables	307 ..	382 ..	546 ..	679
Butcher's Meat	5,785 ..	4,741 ..	7,132 ..	7,283
Poultry.....	3,467 ..	2,624 ..	3,315 ..	2,922
Fish	1,768 ..	1,574 ..	1,619 ..	1,325
Ale and Beer	2,491 ..	2,438 ..	2,746 ..	2,466
Wax Candles	3,011 ..	3,021 ..	3,692 ..	3,813
Tallow Candles	989 ..	663 ..	655 ..	720
Grocery.....	2,414 ..	2,714 ..	2,686 ..	3,222
Oilery	1,518 ..	1,606 ..	1,134 ..	1,446
Fruit and Confectionery	622 ..	521 ..	445 ..	1,056
Milk and Cream.....	718 ..	725 ..	1,046 ..	1,246
Wine, Liqueurs, Spirits, Mineral Waters, Corks, Bottles, &c.	8,732 ..	4,480 ..	5,539 ..	7,161
Lamps	7,030 ..	6,580 ..	5,184 ..	6,758
Washing Table Linen.....	1,702 ..	1,805 ..	2,290 ..	2,582
Fuel	7,194 ..	7,478 ..	6,314 ..	7,665
Stationery.....	628 ..	445 ..	572 ..	697
Turnery.....	206 ..	251 ..	272 ..	340
Braziery, Ironmongery, and Cutlery ..	367 ..	730 ..	693 ..	769
China, Earthenware, and Glass	1,641 ..	494 ..	1,046 ..	860
Linen.....	3,317 ..	2 ..	34 ..	337
	57,744	47,169	53,179	60,194

	1820. £	1823. £	1826. £	1829. £
Brought over.....	57,741	47,169	53,179	60,194
The Royal Gardens.....	19,831 ..	13,782 ..	15,187 ..	13,309
Maunday Expenses	283 ..	274 ..	274 ..	272
Royal Yachts	1,107 ..	387 ..	— ..	—
H. R. H. the Duke of Cumberland	— ..	319 ..	— ..	—
Board Wages to Servants	3,111 ..	3,286 ..	3,283 ..	3,313
Travelling Expenses of ditto.....	480 ..	361 ..	318 ..	357
Allowance for Table Beer.....	608 ..	427 ..	439 ..	301
Salaries to Extra Servants, pay of hired Assistants, &c.....	1,354 ..	2,004 ..	1,900 ..	2,622
Board Wages to Yeomen of the Guard	2,230 ..	2,315 ..	2,230 ..	2,230
Compensations in lieu of Articles for- merly issued in kind	5,542 ..	3,549 ..	3,183 ..	2,783
Sundries and Disbursements.....	12,495 ..	7,492 ..	8,213 ..	8,212
Amount paid in each year	104,789	81,372	88,210	93,597

Board of Green Cloth, 15th Sept. 1830.

THOMAS MARRABLE.

No. II.

Expenditure incurred in the Department of his late Majesty's Robes.

1820.....	£3,513	0	2½
1821.....	5,249	16	11
1822.....	4,625	12	5
1823.....	4,632	18	10½
1824.....	6,152	6	3½
1825.....	4,773	15	2
1826.....	5,687	15	8
1827.....	6,819	19	6
1828.....	5,955	18	3
1829, ending 5th January, 1830.....	6,673	17	5

Office of Robes, 13th Sept. 1830.

TIMY. BRENT.

No. III.

Expenditure of the Master of the Horse's Department.

	1820.	1823.	1826.	1829.
	£	£	£	£
Liveries	7,729 ..	7,530 ..	9,057 ..	7,560
Forage	6,556 ..	5,010 ..	6,368 ..	6,308
Farriery	1,566 ..	906 ..	1,103 ..	1,217
Horses	6,682 ..	5,392 ..	5,687 ..	3,246
Carriages	8,354 ..	944 ..	3,782 ..	4,029
Harness	798 ..	472 ..	785 ..	702
Saddlery	2,053 ..	1,820 ..	817 ..	1,906
Bitts and Spurs	181 ..	48 ..	117 ..	143
Whips	129 ..	135 ..	133 ..	165
Lamps, Gaslights, &c.	505 ..	580 ..	1,012 ..	1,108
Coals and Wood	838 ..	1,076 ..	1,299 ..	1,251
Stationery.....	99 ..	53 ..	48 ..	57
Turnery Articles.....	152 ..	208 ..	190 ..	196
Candles and Soap	165 ..	158 ..	172 ..	167
Washing	120 ..	121 ..	132 ..	140
Ironmongery	48 ..	105 ..	65 ..	79
Allowances for Lodging	— ..	439 ..	367 ..	477
Sundry other small expenses *.....	637 ..	576 ..	607 ..	649
Travelling expenses and disbursements†	1,600 ..	1,487 ..	1,984 ..	1,701
Post Horses.....	649 ..	652 ..	1,488 ..	1,130
King's Plates	2,126 ..	2,126 ..	2,338 ..	2,338
Stud Bills.....	6,705 ..	621 ..	1,666 ..	1,196
Hunt ditto	3,654 ..	3,673 ..	4,313 ..	4,588
Treasury and Exchequer Fees	586 ..	400 ..	494 ..	611
	<hr/> 51,932	<hr/> 34,532	<hr/> 44,024	<hr/> 40,994
Deduct Proceeds of useless Horses sold	915	2,179	2,856	1,226
	<hr/> 51,017	<hr/> 32,353	<hr/> 41,168	<hr/> 39,768

* These expenses are such as water-rent, pew-rent, sand, wheeler's work, sweeping chimneys, blacking, spirits of wine, and in short all articles not included in the foregoing heads.

† The disbursements included in the charge for travelling expenses are those of the clerks of the stables, for women employed to clean the stable-servants' rooms, make the beds, &c. and the allowances to servants in lieu of hair-powder, wigs, and silk stockings.

Master of the Horse's Office, 1st Sept. 1830.

R. W. SPEARMAN.

No. IV.

An Account of the Application of the Monies paid from Admiralty Droits, Gibraltar Duties, and other Funds than Civil List, at the disposal of the Crown, between 1820 and 1830.

	£
The expenses of his late Majesty's journey to Ireland	58,261
Ditto..... ditto to Scotland	21,439
Ditto..... ditto to Hanover	13,206
The Expense of fitting up the state rooms at St. James's	54,947
The Expense of certain repairs to the Royal Lodge in Windsor Great Park	14,966
The expense of repairing the stables at Brighton	7,113
The expense of furnishing the Royal Mews at Pimlico	10,083
The amount issued to his late Majesty's privy purse.....	86,573
The amount issued by his late Majesty's command as contributions to charities	17,648
The expense of furniture purchased for Windsor Castle	10,000
The expense incurred on account of the visit of the Queen of Wirtemberg	16,206
The expense of fitting up the apartments of his present Majesty as Duke of Clarence.....	9,166
The amount advanced to the executors of H. R. H. the Duke of York ..	6,440
	<hr/>
	326,055

Of the foregoing Amount, there was applied, —

To Privy Purse	£ 86,573
To Charities.....	17,648
Services conducted by the Lord Chamberlain	110,024
- - - - Lord Steward	46,956
- - - - Master of the Horse	14,459
- - - - Office of Works	22,080
For the Journey to Hanover	13,206
Expenses of Yachts, Pursuivants, &c. connected with the Journeys to Ireland and Hanover	1,011
For Expenses connected with the Journey in Ireland, incurred by the Irish Government.....	7,653
To the Executors of H.R.H. the Duke of York	6,440
	<hr/>
	£326,055

Whitehall, Treasury Chambers,
26th October, 1830.

GEO. R. DAWSON.

DIVIDENDS PAYABLE ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

An Account of the Total Number of Persons to whom a Half-Year's Dividend on Three per Cent. Consols became due on 5th January last; specifying the Number respectively of those whose Dividend for the Half-Year did not exceed £5, £10, £50, £100, £200, £300, £500, £1000, £2000, and the Number of those whose Dividend exceeded £2000;—a like Account of Dividends on Three per Cent Reduced, payable on 10th October last;—a like Account of the Dividends on Three and a Half per Cent, payable on 10th October last;—a like Account of Dividends on Four per Cent, payable on 10th October last;—a like Account of the Dividends on Long Annuities, payable on 10th October last;—a like Account of the Dividends on New Four per Cent, payable on 5th January last;—and, a like Account of the Dividends on Three per Cent. Annuities, Anno 1726, payable on 5th January last.—*Vide page 322.*

	Not exceeding £5.	Not exceeding £10.	Not exceeding £50.	Not exceeding £100.	Not exceeding £200.	Not exceeding £300.	Not exceeding £500.	Not exceeding £1,000.	Not exceeding £2,000.	Exceeding £2000.	TOTAL.
£3 per cent. Consolidated..	26,596	12,779	30,651	9,326	6,163	2,192	1,421	820	239	82	90,269
£3 per cent. Reduced.....	10,078	4,653	11,460	3,491	2,110	775	455	222	85	32	33,361
£3. 10. per cent. Reduced..	6,933	4,381	10,365	2,978	1,613	428	291	124	39	15	27,167
£3. 10. per cent. 1818	222	186	489	192	155	53	40	32	7	7	1,383
£4 per cent. Annuities, 1826	1,269	735	1,486	430	266	80	71	29	8	5	4,379
Long Annuities	9,077	4,008	9,210	1,985	1,017	339	209	95	20	2	25,962
New £4 per cent. Annuities	29,307	15,403	33,451	7,874	3,857	1,037	589	233	52	18	91,821
£3 per cent. Annuities, 1726	127	82	195	40	28	8	1	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	481
Totals.....	83,609	42,227	97,307	26,316	15,209	4,912	3,077	1,555	450	161	274,823

Bank of England, 15th Feb. 1830.

WILLIAM SMEE, Deputy Accountant.

METROPOLITAN

An Account of all Monies Received and Expended for the Purposes of required by the 29th Section of the Act 10th

Name of Parish, &c.	Rental.	Total Sum Charged.*
CITY and Liberties of WESTMINSTER :		
The parish of St. James	£225,872 £3,764 10 8
The parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields	200,896 3,346 15 4
The parish of St. George, Hanover-square....	504,072 8,401 4 0
The parishes of St. Margaret and St. John the Evangelist.....	115,191 1,919 17 0
Whitehall, Whitehall Gardens and Richmond Terrace, in the foregoing parish	21,300 355 0 0
The parish of St. Paul, Covent-garden	43,402 723 7 4
The parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, as well within the liberty of Westminster as within the Duchy Liberty	12,300 205 0 0
The parish of St. Clement Danes, as well within the liberty of Westminster as within the Duchy Liberty	68,996 1,149 18 8
The parish of St. Ann, in the liberty of Westminster	74,174 1,236 4 8
HOLBORN DIVISION :		
The parish of St. Mary-le-Bone	702,050 11,700 16 8
The parishes of St. Giles-in-the-Fields and St. George, Bloomsbury	266,816 4,446 18 8
The parishes of St. Andrew, Holborn, and St. George the Martyr	118,746 1,979 2 0
The liberty of Saffron-hill, Hatton-garden, and Ely Rents	21,892 364 17 4
The liberty of the Rolls.....	13,390 223 3 4
EXTRA PAROCHIAL PLACES :		
Lincoln's Inn	10,642 177 7 4
Gray's Inn	13,528 225 9 4
Staples Inn	1,524 25 8 0
Furnival's Inn, that part of, in the county of Middlesex.....	3,184 53 1 4
	2,417,885	40,298 1 8
Amount received from Consolidated Fund....		963 10 6

* The assessment is charged and computed at a rate of four-pence in the pound on the entire property in every parish, township, precinct, or place, according to the last valuation acted upon in assessing the county rate. The act prohibits a higher assessment than eight-pence in the pound in one year. The salaries of the commissioners are alone paid out of the general revenue of taxes, and limited to £800 per annum each. The receiver's salary is limited to £700 per annum, and payable out of the produce of the local assessment.

POLICE.

the Metropolitan Police, made up to the 31st of December, 1829, as Geo. IV.—*Parl. Paper*, No. 90, Sess. 1830,

Particulars of Expenditure.	Total Expenditure.
Salaries of receiver, clerks, superintendents, inspectors, serjeants, and police constables	£15,282 11 0
Premiums on station and section houses	430 0 0
Fixtures in ditto ditto	178 4 0
Bedsteads, bedding, tables, chairs, fenders and fire-irons, &c.	1,240 18 1
Furniture, alterations, fitting up and fixtures	1,555 8 9
Repairs and alterations at station and section houses	244 15 8
Coals supplied to police stations and force	324 17 7
Lamps and gas lights, including oil and fitting-up pipes	173 4 9
Rents, taxes and rates for section houses, &c.	22 19 4
Insurance on section house, No. 27, Charles-st., Westminster	1 2 6
Charge for making out lease of No. 5, Red Lion-square	24 10 6
Truncheons, rattles, handcuffs, pistols, swords, staves	682 6 2
Dress for police serjeants and constables	4,768 3 6
Hats, armlets, &c. for ditto	1,014 10 6
	<u>5,782 14 0</u>
Printing, stationery, books, lithography, &c.	495 9 6
Stamps	8 4 8
Maps, admeasurement of districts, &c.	36 7 6
Extra allowance for length of service to men transferred from the Bow-street establishment	16 8 0
Paid by superintendents for cleaning watchhouses, refreshments to prisoners, candles, &c.	68 16 5
Paid for books and information relative to the formation of the new police	80 0 0
Postage, sundries and incidental expenditure	72 8 8
	<u>221 5 1</u>
	<u>27,381 3 9*</u>

JOHN WRAY, Receiver.

* The act requires an account of the sums received and expended to be laid annually before parliament, and the above statement of expenditure includes the outfit and expenditure from the period of the introduction of the new police to Dec. 30, 1829. The expense of the eight police offices for the year ending Jan. 5, 1830 amounted to £69,354 (*Annual Finance Accounts*, p. 135), and is paid out of the general revenue of the country.

Return of the Metropolitan Police Force, with the Number of Divisions,
and an Estimate of Population in each Division. 1st June 1830.

Letter.	Division.	Superinten- dents.	Inspectors.	Serjeants.	Constables.	Total Police Force.	Popula- tion of Divisions.
A.	Whitehall	1	2	14	96	113	5,893
B.	Westminster	1	4	18	145	168	51,618
C.	St. James's	1	4	16	167	188	94,418
D.	Mary-le-bone	1	4	18	147	170	85,040
E.	Holborn	1	4	16	147	168	73,208
F.	Covent Garden ..	1	4	16	145	166	61,618
G.	Finsbury	1	4	20	210	235	102,561
H.	Whitechapel	1	4	18	168	191	111,382
K.	Stepney	1	6	28	262	297	113,516
L.	Lambeth	1	4	18	168	191	45,646
M.	Southwark	1	4	16	168	189	78,169
N.	Islington	1	4	24	222	251	74,455
P.	Camberwell	1	4	19	195	219	64,967
R.	Greenwich	1	4	20	182	207	72,540
S.	Hampstead	1	4	22	190	217	70,260
T.	Kensington	1	4	20	148	173	49,668
V.	Wandsworth	1	4	20	146	171	57,532
Total		17	68	323	2,906	3,314	1,212,491

Total Population of the Metropolitan Police District, according
to the Parliamentary Returns made in the year 1821..... 1,212,491

C. ROWAN.

RICHARD MAYNE.

An Account of the Sum paid in 1829, for Half Pay and Retired Superannuated Allowances; distinguishing the amount under separate Heads and Departments. *Parl. Paper, No. 185, Sess. 1830.*

ARMY.

Army pay of general officers.....	£140,362	12	6
Retired full pay, half pay, and military allowances.....	866,431	12	7
Militia adjutants and serjeant majors.....	11,202	17	6
Local militia adjutants	17,205	14	0
Out-pensioners of Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.....	1,328,797	7	1
In-pensioners of do. do. do.	40,215	0	9
Widows' pensions	151,226	5	9
Compassionate list	37,592	5	0
Royal bounties	34,561	0	9
Pensions for wounds	119,167	17	7
Foreign half pay.....	79,067	13	8
Foreign pensions, including allowances to widows and children of deceased foreign officers	18,712	10	0
Superannuation allowances	48,462	19	0
Commissariat	46,545	5	9
Royal Military Asylum.....	345	13	9
	<hr/> £2,939,896 15 8		

NAVY.

HALF PAY :

To flag-officers, captains, commanders, lieutenants, pursers, masters, and surgeons ..	£824,504	6	4
To royal marine officers.....	51,113	2	10
SUPERANNUATIONS, PENSIONS, AND ALLOWANCES :			
To officers, &c. in the military line of service	127,174	16	5
To commissioners, secretaries, clerks, &c. formerly employed in the civil departments of the navy	130,518	7	11
Victualling department.....	33,331	12	6
Bounty to chaplains	1,372	10	0
Allowances to widows and orphans on the compassionate list	12,808	0	0
Widows' charity.....	148,327	0	0
Greenwich-hospital, out-pensioners	250,000	0	0
	<hr/> £1,579,149 16 0		

ORDNANCE.

MILITARY:

Superannuated and half pay officers	£55,118	0	0
Retired as general officers	13,039	0	0
Allowances for good services	5,099	0	0
Pensions in remuneration for inventions and improvements in artillery service.....	1,200	0	0
Superannuated and disabled men	189,004	0	0
Pensions to wounded officers	7,393	0	0
Pensions to widows and children	22,910	0	0
Retired officers of the late Irish artillery and engineers, and pensions to widows.....	8,590	0	0

CIVIL.

Superannuated and half pay to civil officers, artificers and labourers; retired pay and pensions to civil officers, in consequence of reduction and ill-health.....	36,838	0	0
Pensions to widows	4,666	0	0
Superannuated and half pay to Irish civil offi- cers and artificers and labourers; and pen- sions to widows	4,429	0	0
Barrack department	17,340	0	0
		365,626	0 0

4,884,672 11 8

To which add the Civil Departments of the government, including pensions, super- annuations, and allowances in the treasury, tax-office, customs, excise, stamps, police, &c.		478,967	16 3
--	--	---------	------

Grand Total, military, naval, and civil £5,367,640 7 11

DEAD WEIGHT.

Year 1822.....	5,289,087	19	10
— 1823.....	5,311,248	2	4
— 1824.....	5,317,445	3	7
— 1825.....	5,302,499	18	0
— 1826.....	5,376,674	2	1
— 1827.....	5,455,990	19	4
— 1828.....	5,362,670	16	1

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

UNDER THE

NEW MINISTRY.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM will shortly be the all-engrossing subject of interest; and we feel reluctant to part with our readers, without submitting to them a few additional facts and observations connected with the elucidation of this great question. Only a few months have elapsed since writing the article on the "State of the Representation;" in the interval great changes have intervened—the Wellington ministry has been deposed, and a new ministry has been formed, pledged to the consideration of this national grievance. It was premature discussing plans of reform, while the principle itself remained unconceded; it tended only to weaken our cause, to create divisions and parties; every one had his scheme, and every scheme its proselytes; and thus the Reformers were prevented offering that unanimous appeal to the legislature, which was sure to command attention, because, what they so solicited as a boon, they had obviously the power to enforce as a right. We have, however, now cleared the outer wall, and approach the citadel; and the question with any sane person is no longer whether reform of any kind is expedient, but what description of reform is commensurate to the wants and wishes of the community. It is to this part of the subject we shall direct attention. Political questions are mostly discussed with passion and acrimony, though they are the last which ought to be so investigated; nevertheless, we shall endeavour to state our opinions temperately, knowing that we are only one of a multitude,—that men differ, and honestly too,—and though there is abundant room for concession on all sides, there is none for dogmatism and violence.

The question is, by whom ought the elective franchise to be exercised, and in what manner ought it to be exercised, whether by open or secret suffrage? These are the only points of immediate interest; and if we can conclude a satisfactory arrangement respecting them, such supplemental matters of regulation, as the duration of parliament,—the qualification of candidates—whether placemen shall have seats,

and the like—may be safely referred over to the deliberative wisdom of the house of commons, chosen under the new system, and by the new constituency.

Before advertng particularly to the basis of the elective qualification, let us endeavour to obtain clear ideas relative to those who have hitherto exercised the franchise. We do not allude to the boroughmongers, about whom there can be neither mistake nor mystery, but principally to voters in corporate, and what are termed open boroughs. By observing the manner in which these *have* exercised their privilege, we shall be better enabled to judge by whom, and in what manner, it can be most advantageously exercised in future.

The boroughs which return members are of three sorts; first, the close, pocket, or marketable boroughs, in which the power of returning the members is exercised by one or two individuals; secondly, the corporation boroughs, in which the members are returned by a dozen or two of self-elected corporators; thirdly, the open boroughs, in which the members are returned by voters, varying in number from 500 to 8 or 10,000.

Although the number of voters in the several descriptions of boroughs is so different, there are, in fact, with the exception of London, and perhaps one or two more places, only two mediums through which the members obtain their seat; namely, from personal connexion with the patron, and, open or indirect purchase, by money or money's worth. In this consists the glaring and unequalled defect of our representative system, and which renders it immeasurably inferior to that of a neighbouring kingdom.

In France the number of electors amounts to 80,000; the new law proposes to double this number, which is much too narrow a basis long to satisfy the people of that country. In England the number of electors, who *actually* voted for members of the house of commons, in 1830, has been calculated to amount to 87,000, which is rather more than the number of electors in France; but mark the difference in the two systems of representation. What class, interest, or section of society do the English electors represent? None; not a single social element, either of property, number, or intelligence. For the most part they are in the lowest state of indigence, non-resident, and the hireling tools of the candidates. Contrast these with the conditions under which the French constituency exercise their suffrages. First, the BALLOT excludes corruption and intimidation; and every elector, according to his judgment, may be supposed to vote for the man best qualified to advance the general interests: he can have no other motive; his only grounds for preferring one person to another must be public, not personal to himself, like those of the English elector. Secondly, the French electors comprise nearly the entire proprietary and intelligence of the community; they consist of householders, retailers, shopkeepers, and of the classes more opulent than these: hence they embody, either directly, or through dependence on the working classes, the chief interests of the community.

But these are not the only points of contrast between the two countries: in France there is no richly-endowed Church nor Aristocracy to make head against; there are no interests like the Bank, or East-India Company, or West-India planters, or brewers, or old chartered corporations to counterpoise. The constitution of society is essentially *democratic*; there is no monied aristocracy, nor landed interest: having no primogeniture or entail laws, property is more equally divided. Hence it is, that a much smaller body of electors in France would adequately represent and sustain the interests of the community than would be adequate to similar purposes in England: for it must be borne in mind, that the excellence of any system of representation does not consist in the number of voters, but in the unbiassed and incorrupt exercise of their suffrages, and in their being sufficiently numerous to touch on, and constitute a fair and aliquot proportion of every social interest.

After duly considering the points we have indicated, the reader will not be at a loss to account for the different results presented in the history of the French chamber of deputies and the English house of commons, though both deriving their origin from an elective basis of similar extent, but differently constituted, differently exercised, and with widely different interests to contend against. To these discrepancies in the two countries we have thought it expedient to advert, because it is highly probable that reference will be made to the limited constituency of France, as an argument for a contracted plan of parliamentary reform, which would be neither suited to the peculiarities of our domestic organization, nor adequate to meet the just expectation of the people.

Let us now return to the boroughs; and, first, of the absolutely rotten ones, such as the following, out of scores more, present an example:—

POPULATION.

Old Sarum.....	about 6
Bramber	98
Gatton	135
Newton	about 200
St. Michaels.....	178
Castle Rising	254
Berealston	about 200
Dunwich	209
St. Mawes	about 300
Ludgershall.....	477
East Looe.....	770
Corfe Castle.....	823
Bossiney	877
West Looe	953

These, no doubt, were formerly the metropolitan towns of the country, the hives of industry and population, which have exchanged

condition with Manchester, Leeds, and Liverpool. The population mentioned above is generally that of the entire *parish*; the *borough* which exercises the right of returning the two members being seldom more than a few miserable huts. There is in all these cases but one real voter, the patron, who is generally the lord of the manor; in some instances, as Gatton and Old Sarum, there are literally no inhabitants beyond the bailiff or steward of the estate; and in others, though the population may amount to a few hundreds, the nominal voters seldom exceed twenty,—creatures of the proprietor.

About disfranchising such places there cannot exist the smallest hesitation; such ghosts and mockeries of towns and cities ought long ago to have been struck out of the national representation, which has been the case with others that formerly sent members to parliament. But it is alleged, by some, the proprietors—usurpers or robbers would be a more appropriate term—ought first to receive *compensation*. A borough is reckoned to produce its owner about £3000 a year, the seats being worth £1500 per annum. About £60,000 might, therefore, be the value of the franchise to the patron.* And at this rate it is proposed to *buy up* out of the produce of the taxes, all the decayed boroughs in the kingdom.

What a suggestion! The Boroughmongers have been realizing £3000 per annum by the exercise of the franchises of the people; from the same cause, they, and their families, and connexions have long been in the annual receipt of immense sums, in pensions, salaries, and *sinecures*; and now they wish to sell the fee-simple of their robberies, and receive a full equivalent for the plunder they may hereafter lose by the interruption of their depredations. In lieu of compensation, ought they not to *refund*? What compensation did the thieves and cut-purses of the metropolis receive for the losses sustained by the introduction of the new police? To buy the boroughs—the people's rights, would be to consecrate the vilest injustice, and quite as pernicious in precedent as the ancient blackmail, or compounding with the purloiners of bankers' parcels.

What compensation has any other class of society received for losses sustained by the progress of social improvement? Here is a great measure of national reform about to be introduced, and certain individuals will be damnified thereby. Very well; similar vicissitudes have befallen other sections of the community, and what compensation have they received? What compensation has been awarded to the hundreds of thousands plunged in distress and penury by the introduction of machinery? What compensation has been awarded to the sufferers by the Bank Restriction Act, and the restoration of the currency? What compensation have the publicans obtained for losses incurred by the opening of the beer-trade? What compensation has the poor Irish peasantry received, ejected from their homes under the operation of the Sub-letting Act? None, none; neither would we grant any compen-

* Letter to H. Brougham, Esq. M.P. for Yorkshire, on the State of the Representation, p. 24.

sation to the rot-ocracy. We would award to them the same act of grace and mercy that we would award to the West-India slaveholders; they should have a bill of *indemnity for past crimes*, and they ought to be truly thankful for that.

Next, let us advert to the CORPORATION BOROUGHS, in which the franchise is monopolized by a small corporation, consisting generally of less than twenty-four persons. Many of these corporators have become possessed of the elective right to the exclusion of the great bulk of their fellow-townsmen, by nothing less than direct usurpation. In the time of Charles II. when a design to establish despotism was entertained, the rights of these towns were taken away by a manœuvre. A book was written by Dr. Brady, to prove that the word *commonalty* in a charter meant *corporation*; and in pursuance of this new doctrine the committees of the house of commons, in the course of about twenty years, deprived the inhabitants of a great number of boroughs of their elective rights, limiting them to the select corporation in each town.

As the members of such corporations were generally tradesmen of the place they have been easily subdued by the influence of a neighbouring peer, or wealthy commoner, upon whose support they depended. Friends and relatives, in some cases persons of the lowest condition of life, and even menial servants, have been elected members of such corporations; and these have, in their turn, elected other creatures of their patron, to succeed to vacant places. There are many corporations of this kind which appear to have been instituted as a convenient machinery, by which the elective interest of a patron might be securely managed; the greater number of their members residing at a distance, and visiting the place only to make members of parliament. When the right is vested in freemen, chosen by these corporations, the case is very little altered; as the freedom is seldom conferred upon any individual on whose support the influential party cannot depend. Even plain right has often been arbitrarily denied; and should the favoured persons incline to change their opinions, a host of freemen are admitted on the spur of the occasion to counterbalance their number. Where the right of election has extended beyond these narrow limits to the inhabitants paying scot and lot, the right of persons unfavourable to the influential party, has been successfully defeated, by omitting to rate them to the parish taxes; and friendly magistrates have been found to sanction the omission, though the rejected persons formed the most wealthy portion of the parish. Attempts have been made, from time to time, to open these boroughs, by petitioning the house of commons; but the enormous expense of the prosecution of a petition places redress out of the reach of poor persons.

In dealing with these little nests of corruption, there can certainly exist as little hesitation as in blotting out of the representation the pocket boroughs of peers and rich commoners. The elective franchise ought to be *restored* to the inhabitants generally; and the same course ought to be pursued in respect to those boroughs, in themselves populous, but in which the franchise is absurdly confined to the holders of

BURGAGE TENURES, mostly few in number, but conferring the only right of voting that exists in the place. In very early times, all the burgesses who held houses or lands within the borough were entitled to vote. This has been gradually abridged under various pretexts, but chiefly through parliamentary decisions, and the intrigues of corporations. As the right of sending representatives has been for some centuries regarded as an immunity, it has been restricted to the ancient limits of the place which originally enjoyed it; these limits being often very narrow, wealthy individuals easily acquired the entire real property of the borough; and if the suffrage was confined to burgage-holds, controlled the exercise of it, by conferring on their friends, relatives, and dependents, the right of property during the election. All such boroughs must necessarily be included in the condemned list, and be either totally disfranchised, or the franchise spread over a wider basis.

The last class of boroughs is, those termed "OPEN," such as Bristol and Liverpool. These are, assuredly, the vilest parts of our representation, exhibiting, every election, the most revolting spectacles of venality, drunkenness, riot, and licentiousness. Money is the chief influence, and expended in every possible form of bribery—in treating, in buying freedoms, in idle pageantry, in the fees of legal agents, in the conveyance of voters from distant places, in maintaining them while absent, and reconveying them to their homes with the profits of their bartered franchises. There are not half a dozen places in the kingdom, where an honest man, of known competency and character, can hope to be successful in a contest with a man who will expend a fortune to succeed. Thus it is that rich men, or men who are likely to have places and offices to dispose of, are mostly returned for those places; and it is observable, that the open boroughs have returned a smaller proportion of members, than any other class, distinguished for probity, intelligence, and devotion to popular rights.

The original intent of the charters given to the cities and boroughs of England cannot be mistaken. Unquestionably it was meant that the inhabitants of the places so chartered should elect for themselves representatives in parliament.* It was not, however, intended that this should be done by any indiscriminate scheme of representation; because, the franchise is always found to be vested in some definite class,—in the *freemen*, or the *free burgesses*, or the *free barons*,—clearly shewing that the vassal, menial, or vagrant should not be eligible to the exercise of the elective function; therefore, it was stipulated that the elector should have acquired his freedom, which generally rendered a certain servitude necessary, and ensured his being an inhabitant, and really interested in the prosperity of the town.

Circumstances have intervened to defeat entirely the spirit and intent of this arrangement. The intelligent and independent part of the population of open boroughs are mostly ineligible to vote, while the franchise

* Letter on the State of the Representation, before quoted, p. 6.

is exercised almost exclusively by the non-residents, by the illiterate, the destitute and profligate, whom the accident of birth, servitude or marriage, has qualified. Dispersed throughout the kingdom, the electors have often no subsisting connexion with the place in respect of which they vote, except that which enables them to take a drunken journey thither whenever they can wind up some unhappy "third man," to the perilous determination "of giving every freeman an opportunity of exercising his franchise." The working of this vile system will be best shewn by a few examples, which we shall select from the "*Letter*" to which we have referred.

A deputation of keen electioneers came up, on the last occasion; from Barnstaple, to search for two candidates who were willing to spend some money, and also for voters, either in existence, or who might be manufactured. Having found their candidates, they also met with a young man, whom, with many others, they proposed to make into a voter. He had only completed his twenty-first year three days, when he was carried down to that borough; his freedom granted to him, the cost being paid by the candidates; his whole expenses defrayed; and he was sent back to town with from £10 to £15 *clear profit*. He had never before seen Barnstaple, nor had he any interest in the place, or any knowledge of the candidates or their principles. What, then, was his claim to become an elector of that borough? Merely this, that his father had possessed the freedom, and that his descent, therefore, entitled him to be admitted to it. And this was no solitary case. Scores of similar votes were manufactured in that very place, on that same occasion; and many thousands in the various open boroughs similarly circumstanced.

The little town of Maldon, in Essex, exhibits another striking example. It contains about 2000 inhabitants; but has a charter, which, in due course of time, may embrace the whole kingdom as electors. At the election of 1826, nearly 2000 persons were admitted burgesses, and brought from all parts of the kingdom to be made free; and as thus the demand for voters was always met by a fresh supply, the polling continued for fifteen days, and the aggregate expenses of the three candidates probably exceeded £40,000; the greater part of which was, of course, spent in brutal excess. As the daughters of all freemen have, under this beneficent charter, the right of making their husbands free, several honest couples were married to create voters on the spot; and in some instances the nuptial tie was fastened in vain, for it was too late discovered that the lady had no freedom to give! By the next dissolution, a contest for Maldon will be as costly as for Yorkshire.

Nothing can be plainer than that voters thus made, will be, in a great majority of cases, venal voters,—men whose only object and purpose is to make money by their franchise. Thus, in July last, a reprobate youth assaulted his father, and was taken before a London magistrate, to whom his defence was, that his father had refused to take the necessary steps to obtain for him the freedom of Rochester, which freedom he

said, "*would be worth sixty pounds to him.*" And this youth, too, was not a Rochester man,—he was a London journeyman, totally unacquainted with the wants, and unconcerned in the interests, of that town. But yet, by the law, he was entitled to be made an elector of Rochester, while scores of inhabitants of that place, supporting its trade, bearing its burdens, and interested in its welfare, had no legal claim to be admitted to that franchise.

The natural consequence of the elective power being thrown into the present hands, is beginning to be clearly seen. Statutes against bribery may be multiplied *ad infinitum*, but so long as nine-tenths of the voters consist of those who prefer *sovereigns* to principle—and so long as candidates and their agents are found to slip into their hands bank-notes for £10 or £20—so long, in defiance of five hundred anti-bribery statutes, will the most extensive venality flourish.

At Nottingham, one gentleman confessed to having paid away, in the election of 1826, above £3000 in bribery in a single day. At Leicester, the voters, in anticipation of a contest, expressed their hope that the price of votes might rise to £10, as they said it commonly did, if the struggle was severe. At Hull, one of the sitting members dared not appear before his constituents,—not for any defalcation of duty in Parliament, but because he had not paid "the polling money" for the last election. A similar fate awaited Mr. Baring, at Canterbury. At Shrewsbury, and at Maidstone, and at Evesham, and at Bristol, the same kind of language showed clearly that the *price of votes* was in every case the prevailing idea in every elector's mind. At the Liverpool election £85,000 was expended, and the voters kept back with the hope of extorting higher prices, and when obtained openly gloried in their shame!

In fact, in above one hundred boroughs, accounted more or less *open*,—that is, in which the right of voting is not that of burgage-tenure, or confined to a close corporation,—in the whole hundred such boroughs, it would be difficult to point out *five*, in which bribery is not the main spring of every election. That is, not as prevailing in a greater or lesser degree, among some of the poorer of the voters, but as pervading the whole mass,—as participated in by all, except some few solitary instances,—and, in nearly every case, finally deciding the fate of the election, and the individuals returned.

The present system, if not interfered with, would speedily destroy itself. The multiplication of non-resident freemen, claiming the franchise by right of parentage, is so rapidly proceeding, as to render a contest for a borough as perilous to the pocket as a contest for a county. It has been ascertained that the outlay of one of the successful candidates at the late election for the city of York, amounted to nearly £20,000! If the expenditure of the other two candidates is added, the sum squandered at this one contest, must have fallen little short of £50,000. The Leicester election of 1826 cost Mr. Evans £19,000, Otway Cave £10,000, sir Charles Hastings £16,000, and the Corporation £16,000,

in all £61,000 ; Warwick cost £27,000 ; Colchester cost one candidate £26,000 ; and Stafford cost £14,000.*

It may be fairly asked, Who is benefited by this enormous waste of money ? None, surely, but the most vicious of society. No useful purpose is answered by this vast expenditure. But if no class of the community, save that which ought alone to be disregarded,—the present race of profligate voters,—if no class save these feel an interest in the present system, why is it still maintained in existence ? Why is not some plan matured for restoring this branch of the representation to the state originally contemplated by its founders, thereby affording a more efficient influence and expression to the probity and intelligence of the community. That some plan might be framed we will shortly explain ; but first let us endeavour to draw one or two conclusions from the preceding view of the representation.

First, it is clear that not one of the three descriptions of boroughs, with the existing mode of election, is compatible with any future scheme of parliamentary reform. The pocket boroughs, and the corporation boroughs, are alike objectionable, as representing only their proprietors, or the few individuals who return the members. The open boroughs are still more inadmissible, they are as corrupt and limited in the interests they really represent as either of the preceding classes, with the further disadvantage of elections in them being productive of disgusting crimes and irregularities.

Secondly, it is obvious a mere extension of the franchise, unaccompanied with other modifications, would afford no additional guarantee of popular rights and interests.

Omitting from the calculation the freeholders of the counties and the electors of the metropolis, it may be safely asserted that of the whole remaining body of the electors of England, *three-fourths* are of the labouring classes. And it may with equal truth and safety be asserted that nearly the whole of these three-fourths are in some way or other bribed. This is incontestably proved from the facts mentioned above. But Bristol and Liverpool are decisive of this point ; in both these places the DEMOCRACY is omnipotent, the freemen consist almost exclusively of shipwrights, journeymen and labourers, and what description of members—what friends and advocates of popular rights have they returned to parliament ? They have chosen Canning, Huskisson, and Bright, and rejected Romilly, Hunt, and Brougham !

But common sense tells us, without an appeal to facts, that *bribery*,

* The counties have exhibited similar squanderings. Yorkshire cost Mr. Marshall £30,000. The Northumberland elections cost a very large sum. Mr. Bell probably paid between 60 and £70,000 for his seat of two months from February, and his four sessions' seat from July 1826. Mr. Liddle probably £50,000. Lord Howick £12,000 ; and Mr. Beaumont was charged upwards of £100,000, but he contrived to pay with a much smaller sum. The candidates for Essex must be minus no trifle. Indeed it is plain the system is on its last legs, from the operation of manifold causes, and if we have no reform we shall, in future, have very few contested elections either for boroughs or counties.

under the existing system, must be the predominant influence. How is it possible the present class of voters can act independently? A seat in parliament is an object so coveted, that the strongest efforts are always used to gain it. And when these efforts are brought to bear upon a person toiling fourteen hours for the present wages, how are they to be resisted? First, there is his landlord,—he who can turn his family into the street: then there is his employer,—he who can deprive his family of bread: and, if these cannot be efficiently used, then there is the *ten-pound note*, to a man, almost shoeless and shirtless, who has not five shillings in the world, and whose rent-day, perhaps, or his wife's confinement, is hard at hand.

We conclude, then, that it is indispensable to introduce entirely new elements into the representation; and that rotten-boroughs, corporation-boroughs, and open-boroughs are all equally inimical to the welfare of the people. What these elements are we shall next enquire; and this brings us to the consideration of the elective qualification, and the ballot, with which we shall conclude. The county representation we pass over; it is a subject, we apprehend, on which there cannot exist much difficulty, as the extension of the right of voting, to copyholders and leaseholders, and a less expensive mode of taking the poll, are such equitable and obvious improvements, that difference of opinion can hardly prevail about their immediate adoption.

THE ELECTIVE QUALIFICATION.

No good reason can be alleged why every one should not share in the making of laws to which he is amenable. The person is not less precious than property; and laws which affect the security of the former are certainly not less important to every individual than those which affect the security of the latter. It is not, therefore, liability to the payment of taxes, but legal responsibility, which prescribes the utmost limit to the right of suffrage.

But the admission of such a principle is clearly incompatible with any practicable form of government: it would entitle all, with scarcely any exception, to participate in legislation, either directly or by representation; it would embrace females, as well as males; all minors would be included, of whatever age, provided they were judicially responsible: in short, none would be disqualified, except the insane, and infants of so tender age, that they are unable to distinguish right from wrong. The introduction of such an unlimited scheme of suffrage, we apprehend, no one seriously contemplates. Still, if we are asked, why we would adopt any other principle of exclusion; why disfranchise women in preference to men, or minors to majors; why we would allow a person to vote at the precise age of twenty-one, and not at twenty or eighteen; we confess, in answer to these inquiries, we can only give one reply, namely, that *EXPEDIENCY*, and not strict justice, dictates their exclusion.

This brings us to the fundamental principle by which political ques-

tions must be invariably decided. They must be determined, not on any abstract view of justice, but general advantage. It is not by reverting to rights, or, more correctly, *powers* appertaining only to man in a natural state, that we can ascertain his civil immunities; we can only look to the general good; or, as Mr. BENTHAM significantly terms it, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number."

Upon this principle we exclude minors from voting, because their interests may be presumed to be identified with those of their parents; we exclude females from voting, because their interests are merged in those of their husbands, fathers, or brothers. How much farther the principle of exclusion should be carried is a practical question only—one of utility, not theory. Whether the right of suffrage should be universal, or limited to householders, or to those assessed to the poor-rate, or direct taxes, is a consideration which must be decided, by ascertaining which would be most conducive to public happiness. The end of just government is the equitable and adequate protection of *all interests*; and, provided this is attained, the object for which the suffrage is exercised becomes amply secured. The task of legislation is a part of the labour of society; and it is only a clumsily contrived social machinery—approaching to the organization of the savage state—if it demand the participation and exertion of every individual.

Having prefaced these general observations, let us at once come to the point, and determine the elective qualification which would be most advantageous to the people of England. We are favourable to universal suffrage, but we have our doubts whether it is a claim which ought to be urged at the present moment, and whether it would be most conducive to the objects sought by the friends of liberty—namely, the diffusion of knowledge—unlimited freedom of inquiry—and the increase of the rights and enjoyments of the industrious classes.

It is obvious that universal suffrage is not a principle of universal application, and adapted to all times and places. For instance, what would be the tendency of this scheme, aided by the *BALLOT*, in Spain and Portugal? It would, evidently, revive the inquisition, increase and perpetuate the domination of the priesthood; confirm the despotisms of Don Miguel and Don Ferdinand, and strengthen all interests opposed to liberal ideas, to the developement of internal resources, and the promotion of the prosperity of the Peninsula. Universal suffrage and the ballot would operate in a similar manner in Ireland. There the people are so lamentably ignorant as to be entirely at the mercy of a fanatical priesthood, who pillage them without mercy, under the pretext of saying masses for the repose of the dead! The condition of Ireland in the nineteenth century—to the eternal reproach of our Oligarchical government—is a living type of the state of England anterior to the Reformation. And what, we ask, would universal suffrage have done for us at that era? Would it have broken the power of the monks, or of the feudal barons? Certainly not; it would have perpetuated vassalage; and had such a regime continued, the body of the people would have been in no better condition at this day than that of the boors of Russia,

who are now being moved forward by the Autocrat, like droves of cattle, to trample under foot the liberties of the Poles.

England has, no doubt, made a great progress since the period to which we have adverted; but we still fear the effects of the mass of error which remains. Two-thirds of the people at least were unfavourable to Catholic emancipation; that is one indication of popular knowledge. The deplorable intellectual state of the agricultural population has been too clearly established during the late trials. In the manufacturing districts, the general state of information, we apprehend, is exaggerated. Those who take a part in political questions are not a fair sample of the bulk; in case of universal suffrage being adopted, they would constitute only the minority; the majority would consist of another description—the votaries of the conventicle or the gin-shop—the vassals of the publican or the disciples of the apostle of fanaticism.

Out of such elements, what kind of parliament could the friends of liberty expect to see constituted? Certainly not one favourable to them or their hopes. It would not represent the *light* of the age, but its *darkness*; and its deliberations would be more analogous to the proceedings of a Methodist conference or presbyterian assembly than those of an enlightened body of legislators. It would be the triumph of error over truth, and give ascendancy to a gloomy and intolerant superstition, hostile alike to knowledge, to free inquiry, and social enjoyment.

These, we know, are not the results anticipated by Reformers, nor such as they wish to predominate; but we are convinced that, in the existing state of society, they are a part of the evils which would flow from the adoption of the principle some of them advocate. We may be mistaken in our anticipation; but we have spoken on this, as on every other subject throughout this publication, according to the best of our knowledge and belief. We shall not be sorry to be found in error; for we have no objection to the most extended suffrage, provided it can be shown to be conducive to popular rights and happiness.

Having said thus much on the general tendency of universal suffrage, we may be permitted to say a few words on its practicability. By peaceable means it is wholly unattainable; nothing but absolute force, nothing short of a revolution, subversive of every thing, would accomplish it; and then it would not subsist a twelvemonth, without leading to anarchy and despotism. The middling classes, with hardly an exception, are indisposed to such a sweeping measure; but without the co-operation of the middling classes no political reform can be obtained. In France the encroachments of the Bourbons were resisted, and they were, finally, expelled from the soil they had polluted, by the co-operation of the industrious orders. It is only by a similar united effort that the Church and Aristocracy of this country can be successfully resisted. What was it that rendered the efforts of the Reformers abortive in 1817 and 1818? Upwards of TWO MILLIONS of petitioners prayed for parliamentary reform; yet this numerical array was powerless

of effect, and disappeared like water on a sandy bed. The cause of this memorable failure may be readily found in the fact that the people were not seconded by any portion of the proprietary; the consequences of the revolutionary wars had not penetrated deep enough into the substance of society: the case is now altered, and it is because it is altered that the Boroughmongers are disposed to concession. But though the middling classes are as fully bent on parliamentary reform as any other section of society, it is such a reform as would restore, not destroy.

Before concluding, we would beg to inquire whether by universal suffrage it is meant the floating population of towns should be eligible to vote? Vagrants, Irish immigrants, and persons of that description for instance. We apprehend the idea has not been sufficiently analyzed; if it had we feel convinced a scheme so indefinite could have few advocates, except among such mock reformers as Harlequin Sheridan, who professed to be the advocate of universal suffrage, because he deemed it utterly unattainable, and an excellent device for creating divisions, by which every plan of public improvement might be ridiculed and frustrated.

THE BALLOT.

OF the utility of the ballot we have no doubt. It is supported by reason and opposed only by sentiment. Even under the existing system it would be an effective antidote to the bribery, intimidation, and venality predominant in the open boroughs. It would be favourable to the peace of towns, to harmony among the different classes of inhabitants; it would be subversive of cabaling, intriguing, and partizanship, and operate alike beneficially on candidate and elector, by depriving the former of all claim to the suffrages of his constituents, and the latter of all motives for granting them, except public desert and fitness for the representative function.

An extension of suffrage without the ballot would be an evil—an aggravation of the abuses of the open borough system—and be a curse in lieu of a blessing to the voters who exercised it.

Those who advocate the former alone cannot be sincere—they must meditate a deception of the people. What is the object sought by an extension of the franchise? Certainly that those who obtain it may have a responsible organ through which their opinions and interests may be represented. But what is the advantage of a vote unless it can be freely and independently given for the promotion of the ends for which it has been granted. Of what avail is the suffrage to a workman, house-keeper, or tradesman, if he must exercise it under the dictation of his employer, his landlord, or customers? In this case the franchise is not given, it is only delegated; and the elector is merely the proxy of him who has power to control his choice of a candidate.

The utility of the ballot is so manifest and it has been so forcibly illustrated by others that we think we may leave it and conclude that it is "safe." Lord Althorp appears to be an honest man, and has declared in favour of the ballot, and we believe all honest men will speedily con-

cur in his lordship's opinion. It is an indispensable condition of every plan of parliamentary reform, and without it we are convinced no scheme that can be proposed will satisfy or be listened to by the people.

We have thus shortly touched on the two important considerations of the elective qualification and the mode of election. Our argument on universal suffrage may be briefly stated as follows: 1. That it is no more consistent with strict justice to all classes of the community than other plans of suffrage, but, like them, is founded on principles of expediency and exclusion. 2. That such an extended suffrage is not necessary to the protection of all classes and interests. 3. That parliamentary reform can only be obtained by a cordial union of the proprietary and industry of the country, and that such union is impeded by the urging of a claim which many deem unnecessary, some impracticable, and others absolutely dangerous and revolutionary. Lastly, it has been shown that such a scheme of representation is not adapted to all times and places, and that, in the existing state of society in England, it would be inimical to the social improvements which the friends of liberty are anxious to promote.

We shall conclude with recapitulating the chief points which, in our opinion, Parliamentary Reform ought to embrace.

First, all cities and boroughs returning members to parliament to be disfranchised.

Secondly, the elective qualification to be uniform throughout the kingdom.

Thirdly, every householder assessed to the poor-rate to be eligible to vote. In Scotland and Ireland an equivalent elective qualification to be introduced.

Fourthly, the election to be by ballot.

Fifthly, the number of representatives chosen by every town or district to be proportioned to the number of electors.

Lastly, one fourth of the members to retire annually in rotation, but to be eligible to be re-elected.

A plan of representation embracing these, or similar, conditions, would, in our opinion, adequately represent the numbers, property, and intelligence of the community, and apply the most equitable and efficient remedies to public distress and embarrassment. The chief point, as before observed, is the elective qualification, and it may be here asked,—

Why limit the right of suffrage to householders? If we have not sufficiently answered this question, we will endeavour to do it. In the first place, we must inquire why those who demand a lower qualification do not carry their claims to the utmost limit of abstract justice; why do they exclude females or minors; why do they stop at twenty-one or eighteen years of age? We contend that, agreeably to strict right, every one, of whatever age or sex, is entitled to share directly or by representation in the making of laws to which he or she is amenable. Universal suffrage, as commonly expounded, is an *exclusive* scheme; so is ours: the difference between them is one of degree not of principle. Our reasons for limiting the suffrage to householders are practical;

they are that such limitation would render reform attainable, while a more indefinite scheme might defeat it; that the fact of keeping house, though it confers no right, indicates a class of persons settled in life, of mature age and fixed abode, and that such qualification is adequate to the protection of *all interests*, would conciliate the timid, and preserve the suffrage itself from degradation. Lastly, let it be borne in mind that persons are not excluded from the suffrage on the ground of right, on the pretext that they have no stake, no interest in the country; but simply because the exercise of it would be unprofitable to themselves and the community, and as useless as two persons holding a pen in place of one.

To expect that the Aristocracy will concede further than to householders—even if they concede so far—is wholly chimerical. We might as well at once expect them to abolish the monarchy, the church, and house of peers. But we shall leave the subject.

As our object is to communicate information and promote discussion on a momentous question, rather than prematurely to tie down ourselves or readers to any definite plan of reform, we will submit another suggestion that would not only accomplish a great improvement in finance, but also the two conditions which lord Camden deemed essential, by rendering representation co-extensive with taxation.

We propose, then, that all the present taxes be repealed, and an equivalent income-tax in a gradually increasing ratio be substituted on all incomes amounting to a hundred pounds and upwards. Secondly, we propose, that the lowest income taxed have one vote; that a one thousand pound income have two votes; a four thousand pound income three votes; a sixteen thousand pound income four votes; and so on, the number of votes increasing in an arithmetical series as the incomes increase in a fourfold geometrical proportion. We have not had leisure to ascertain how this system would work, but as we are about to bid our readers farewell for the present, we intend, by the time we again meet, to be prepared with an opinion upon it.

ANALYSIS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ELECTED IN 1830.

Relations of peers	256
Placemen and pensioners	217
Officers in the army	89
Officers in the navy	24
Lawyers	54
East India interests	62
West India interests	35
Bankers	33
Agricultural interests	356
Miscellaneous	51

POSTSCRIPT.

By some oversight we omitted, at page 340, mentioning *The Examiner* among the advocates for a repeal of the Stamp Duties on Newspapers, and it is simply an act of justice to supply this omission; since hardly any journal has suffered so much, and been so long distinguished by its devotion to the cause of liberty and social improvement.

I N D E X.

- Aberdeen*, earl, professor of diplomatic conceits, 416
- Abergavenny*, earl, ought to relinquish his pension, 416
- Absolution*, how granted by the clergy, 71
- Abuse* under existing system cannot be reformed, only commuted, 403
- Advowsons* not inviolate like private property, 17; the right of an honorary function merely, 18; owners of ought not to be compensated for loss of, 77
- Acts of parliament*, headlong facility with which passed, 253; cause of obscurity of, 256; examples of hodge-podge, 257; blundering nature of results from after-dinner mode of business in house of commons, 258
- Agriculture*, protection afforded to, in our fiscal regulations, 204
- Albemarle*, lord, not expected to make his first appearance as a court lord, 417
- Ale-drinkers*, the poisoning of, not of much consequence, 285
- Alison*, A. to whom indebted for his preferments, 504
- Althorp*, lord, suggestions to, for benefiting the country, 417; mistake on duchy of Lancaster revenues, 453; hint to on the pension list, 495; in favour of the ballot, 563
- Ambassadors*, expense of, 183; qualifications of, 184
- Amherst*, earl, origin of his pension, 418
- Anson*, lord, his office the Whigs ought to have abolished, 408
- Archdeacon*, duties of, 55
- Argyle*, duke, why not abolish his office of keeper of great seal, 419
- Army*, abuses in civil department of, 330; return of half-pay of, 549
- Aristocracy*, singular privileges of lords formerly, 197; seceded from their civil duties, 199; principal motives for institution of, ceased, 200; statute *de donis* to preserve "the order," *ib.*; primogeniture and entails an usurpation on general rights of mankind, 201; absurd and unjust privileges of, 202; partial system of taxation by, 204; rental of, proper fund for taxation, 206; tyrannical game-laws of, 209; landed incomes of, 212; not their estates which excite popular cupidity, but usurpations of the franchises of the people, 213; assessment of under income-tax, 214; their property does not entitle them to monopolize political power, *ib.*; source of riches of individuals of, 215; imposed chief taxes on industrious classes, 219; increase in number of, 219; all our institutions aristocratic and all abuses result from, 223; state of agricultural population proof of viciousness of in church and state, 489
- Arrest* for debt, limits under which ought to be allowed, 271
- Assaye*, battle of, 359
- Athlone*, earl, family of and pension, 419
- Attorneys*, increased 50 per cent. in number, 261; their absurd conduct in choice of counsel, 280
- Audit-office*, abuses in, 330
- Ballot*, sir R. Wilson on, 496; reasons for, 563; indispensable in every plan of parliamentary reform, 564
- Banking*, evils which have resulted from, 377; remedied by Peel's bill, 471
- Bank of England* projected by a Scotchman, 378; privileged to carry on business of pawnbrokers, 379; gradually lower denomination of notes, 380; causes of Restriction Act, 381; amount of bullion in the Bank at the stoppage, 382; restriction of cash-payments, 383; evils which resulted from Restriction act, 384; irrespon-

- sible power over the circulation, *ib.*; sources of the profits of, *ib.*; expenses of management of, 385; enormous profits of, 387; conceal their gains from the public, 388; hanged and transported 800 persons, and realized a profit of 300 per cent., 389; exclusive privileges in banking, hurtful tendency of, 390; present state of affairs of, 391
- Banks*, H. his extreme care of inhabitants of Corfe Castle, 505
- Baring*, Mr. his statement of revenue of see of London, 43
- Barnstaple*, electors of, 557
- Bathurst*, Bragge, introduces parson's indemnity bill, 35
- Bathurst*, earl, sinecures and pensions of family of, 420
- Belsham*, Mr. on application of secret service money, 146
- Benfield*, Paul, members put by him in house of commons, 366
- Bentham*, on lawyers, 258; utility, principle of, 561
- Bexley*, lord, a sincere religionist, 69; incapacity of as chancellor of exchequer, 423
- Birch*, Dr. a Gresham professor, an inquiry of, 506
- Bishops*, claims of bench of, to promotion, 21; their greediness of filthy lucre, 24; changes on the death of, *ib.*; discharge their duties by deputy, 29; do not pay their secretaries stipends, 35; estimate of incomes of, in king's book, 43; conduct of, on catholic question, 73; exemplify a game at chess, 74; alphabetical list of, 502; income of, in king's book, 537
- Blomfield*, bishop, promoted for rendering Greek verses, 21; letter on profanation of Lord's day, 38; his tythe scheme ought to be defeated, 67
- Boroughs*, alphabetical list of, number of electors, names of patrons, right of election, &c. 235; close, corporate, and open, 553; ought all to be disfranchised, 559
- Boroughmongers*, compensation to, 554
- Boston*, lord, purchases tithes of Hillingdon, 40
- Book* of common prayer, its defects, 69; alteration in, by lord Sidmouth, 72
- Bristol*, earl of, noted absentee bishop, 101
- Bristol* democracy, all-powerful, 559
- Brougham*, lord, his description of the Scottish church, 75; his apostrophe on the debtor laws, 273; on costs of law-suits, 276; his disinterested exertions for remedy of legal abuses, 278; his emoluments as lord chancellor, 424; remarks on his taking that office, 425; infirmities of his character, 426
- Brydges*, sir John, account of his election for Coleraine, 427
- Buccleugh*, duke of, obtains lease of crown-lands, 122; his income, 213; arose from heiresses, 215
- Buller*, James, how he saddles the country with a pension, 428
- Burgess*, G. success of family in the church, 508
- Burke*, Mr. wished the pastor not to be a tax-gatherer, 76; his merits and pension, out of what fund paid, 139
- Canning*, Mr. general profligacy of his principles, 176; system of government under Perceval and Huskisson, 413; pension to his family, 430
- Camden*, marquess, his noble sacrifice, 429
- Campbell*, Thomas, his pension, 430
- Cape of Good Hope*, cost of, 337
- Carr*, hon. Jane, her pension and marriage, 427
- Carey*, bishop, author of a Jubilee sermon, 22
- Castlereagh*, lord, description of House of Commons, 231
- Calvinism*, its monstrous impiety, 70
- Ceylon*, cost of, to England, 337
- Chad*, Mr. his charge for missions, 185
- Chatham's*, lord, observations on the church, 69
- Chancery*, court of, real cause why not reformed, 281
- Child-wit*, singular privilege of Aristocracy, 197
- Cheap* political publications, advantages of, 345; would have prevented FIRES and destruction of machinery, 345
- Charter-house*, masters exempt from residence, 34
- Chaplainships*, source of clerical income, 46
- Christianity*, benefits derived from, 1; principles of, not to spare the rich and plunder the poor, 104
- Church of Englandism*, expense of, and other churches, 58
- Church property*, origin and tenure of,

- 9; proved to be public property, 15.
See *Tithes*.
- Church catechism*, its defects, 70
- Church of England*, who would be benefited by reform of, 73; see *Clergy*, *Tithes*, *Patronage*, and *Pluralities*; intolerance of illustrated, 111
- Cities and boroughs*, alphabetical list, number of electors, patrons, &c. 235
- Civil List*, delusion practised respecting, 119; improvident settlement of on the late king, 147; pensions payable out of, 151; classes into which divided, and charge of each, 153; comparison of civil list of George III. & IV. 158; income of George IV. exceeded that of his predecessor HALF A MILLION, 159; reductions which ought to be made in expenditure of, 160; personal expenditure of king stated, 161; contingencies of, 163; charge of during two last reigns 100 millions, 169; general conclusion on, 177; Mr. Goulbourne, his curious introduction of, 446; official returns, illustrative of, 511, 544
- Clapham*, rev. S. how made a pluralist, 509
- Cleavers*, J. F. owe preferments to bishop of St. Asaph, 509
- Clergy*, established, of England, cost more than clergy of other countries united, 5; their names associated with the most disastrous measures in the history of the country, 6; neglect the education of the people, *ibid.*; not charitable to the poor, 7; do not explain to the people causes of their privations, *ibid.*; contrast of the wealth and pomp of the rich clergy, with the poverty of their humbler brethren, 8; constitution and government of similar to that of the army, 16; their rights not similar to those of corporations, *ibid.*; removable like tenants-at-will, 17; influence of clergy in public meetings, 20; number of incumbents, 71, 91, 27; pretexts of for non-residence, 30; returns, in 1830, of non-residents, 33; what services from clergy for ten millions a year, 38; sources of the revenues of, *ibid.*; income of from public charities, 44; general statement of revenues of, 48; average income no criterion of disposition of church property, 49; real situation of the clergy stated, 51; division of church revenue among the several orders of clergy, 54; their stipends compared with other countries, 60; conduct of in respect of first fruits, 61; houses of call for, 66; conduct of in respect of compositions, 67; the revenues of the real El Dorad, 570; conclusions on, 112; incomes of, in the king's book, 535
- Cobbett*, Mr. exclamations by, on the splendour of the ancient cathedrals, 14
- Cobbold*, rev. T. one of the Winchester witnesses, 510
- Cockburn*, Mr. his missions to Bogota and back, 185
- Coke*, Mr. describes reign of George III., 298
- Colchester*, lord, a shuffling lawyer, 432
- Colman*, George, examiner of plays, his vagaries, 432
- College* livings, remarks on, 523
- Colonies*, utility of, 335; rage for, one of great blunders of aristocratic rule, *ibid.*
- Collet*, rev. W. his attempt to sow dissension among his parishioners, 510
- Compensations*, unjust principle of, 405; abolition of useless offices, like introduction of new machinery, 406; curious examples of, 409
- Combermere*, lord, outshines the duke in the tent scene, 494
- Commissioners* of bankrupt, profits of, 262
- Consular* establishments, object and expense of, 188
- Cornwall*, duchy of, revenues of, 453
- Coronations*, expense of, 339
- Court* pension list, 151
- Courts* of justice, way to, over a bridge of gold, 104
- Courts* of request, their mischievous tendency, 263
- Courts* of law. See *Laws*.
- Counties* palatine, parade of useless offices in, 150
- Cowper*, earl, his character and pension, 433
- Cove*, Dr. traces tithes to Adam, 9
- Creevy*, Mr. on application of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties, 142
- Croker*, John Wilson, an "high and efficient public man," 404; his pamphlet to alarm the proprietary, 435; his lease of crown land, *ibid.*

- Crown*, how dignity of best maintained, 497
- Crown-lands*, nature and origin of, 120; corrupt leases of, 121; property of the public, 127; income and expenditure of, 128; establishment for management of, 130; estimate of the value of, 131; utility of sale of shown, 132
- Cromwell*, his opinion on lawyers, 289
- Curates* only working part of clergy, 52
- Cursitors*, for London and Middlesex, a hint to, 293
- Customs* board, increase in salaries, 489
- Daniels*, Rev. W. payment to out of Admiralty droits, 135
- Deans and chapters*, revenues of, 43; duties of a farce, 55
- Dead-weight* entail of aristocratic war, 396; official return of, 549
- Dead-weight* annuity project, 316
- Debtor-law*, fraud and impoverishment resulting from, 263; inconsistent operation of on property, 272
- De donis* statute of "great men" explained, 200
- Dissenters*, proportion of to Church of Englandists, 59; treatment of, 110
- Dock-yards*, abuses in, 331
- Don Miguel* and *Don Ferdinand*, their tyranny prevent the increase of population, 13
- Donoughmore*, earl of, a good officer, but might abate his pension, 427
- Double-doctrine* held by most public men, 3
- Droits* of crown and admiralty, buccaneer origin of, 133; management of, 134; purposes to which they have been applied, 135; sums paid to royal family out of, 137; total produce of, *ib.*
- Dunning*, his mode of expounding statutes, 252
- Easter offerings*, produce of, 46
- East-India Company* an outwork of the oligarchy, 350; origin and progress of, 151; furnish, gratis, 10,000 tons of shipping on alarm of invasion, 355; war and territorial acquisitions, 356; patronage and government, 360; number of persons in civil service, 364; salaries of, *ib.*; superannuation allowances, 365; territorial revenues and commerce, 367; agreement with public respecting their tea-sales violated, 369; success of the private trade, 371; public pay dividends in monopoly-price of tea, 369; renewal of the charter considered, 372; real point of interest between company and public stated, 375; sources of relief to company without levying poll-tax on people of England, 376
- Ecclesiastical directory*, number of clergy computed from, 26
- Ecclesiastical establishments* on Continent mostly reformed, 4; not a part of Christianity, 57
- Edinburgh Review* on legal insecurity of property, 274
- Eldon*, lord, lived to see the issues of his politics, 439
- Elective* qualification, what, 560
- Elections*, expenses of, 558
- Ellenborough*, lord, a cause of dear justice, 439
- Entails*, an usurpation on general rights of mankind, 201
- Erck*, Mr. his Irish ecclesiastical register, 88
- Escheats*, produce of, to the crown, 144
- Eton college*, abuses of, 513
- Exchequer-bills*, nature of, explained, 305
- Exchequer*, abuses in, 328
- Excise-board*, increase of salaries in, 80
- Excise laws*, oppressions under, 281
- Fines and recoveries*, their absurdity, 269
- First-fruits*, conduct of rich clergy respecting, 61
- Fisher*, Rev. P. master of the Charter-house, 512
- Fitzclarences*, their pensions, 441; ought to be satisfied, *ib.*
- Fox*, Mr. his mission to Buenos Ayres, 186
- Fox*, Charles James, on religion of whigs and tories, 69; his bill for government of India, 264; his politics and character as a statesman, 442
- Forgery-act*, example of blundering legislation, 257
- Foreign ministers*, charge of, 193; pensions to, 194
- Four-and-a-half per cent.* leeward-island duties, origin of, 138; a famous parliamentary jobbing-fund, *ib.*; total produce of, 140; extraordinary ruse of Wellington ministry respecting, 141
- Foster*, *Leslie*, his statement of waste land in Ireland, 114

- France* had to defend not conquer free institutions by the battle of three days, 493; elective system of, 552
- Funding-system*, exposition of, 303; catastrophe of, described, 320
- Game-laws*, monstrous tyranny of, 209; inconsistencies of Nimrods, 210; repeal of, worth the three days' fight of the Parisians, 212
- Garnier*, Rev. Thomas, utility of church for making marriage-settlements, 513
- George III.*, policy and character of his reign, 172
- George IV.*, ditto, 175; confirmed Lavater's theory, 176; his expenses in robes, 542
- Gibbon*, his description of the demeanour of Roman statesmen towards religion, 2
- Gibraltar duties*, origin and application of, 143
- Graham*, Sir James, his exposition of the privy council, 181; his status as a politician not generally understood, 447
- Grafton*, Duke of, his pension, 447
- Gresham lectures*, abuse of, 506
- Grevilles*, ample provision for them, 448
- Grey*, Earl, strictures on composition of his ministry, 449; crowding offices on his family, 454; his opinions on the currency question, 472; promotion of brother to a deanery, 515
- Gordon*, Mr. remarks on abuses in exchequer, 329
- Goodall*, Rev. I. provost of Eton College, 513
- Goodenough*, W. origin of church-preferments, 515
- Government*, general principles of, last fifty years, 413
- Goulbourne*, Mr. better calculated for ecclesiastical than secular affairs, 446
- Gower*, estates, origin of, 215
- Grosvenor*, family wealth of, sprang from building-speculations, 215
- Guildford*, Earl, church-preferments of, how derived, 515
- Half-pay*, number of officers on, 396; abuses in regulation of, 397; return of, 549
- Hallam*, Mr. on effect of suppressing religious houses, 12; aristocracy derived wealth from spoils of reformation, 215
- Hamilton*, professor, explains true principles for reducing the debt, 313
- Harvey*, Mr. his speech on the crown lands, 120; his oversight in estimating value of Middlesex ground-rents, 131
- Henley*, lord, aristocratic stuff about, 452
- Hereditary* revenues of the crown, 118; total produce of, 145
- Hett*, W. origin of church preferments of, 516
- Hillingdon*, composition for tithes in parish of, 40
- Hill*, lady, note on pension to, 453
- Hingstone*, James, a noted Irish pluralist, 93
- Holy Ghost*, how the clergy are filled with the, 72
- Hobart*, church preferments of, 517
- Holland*, lord, made the butt of the radicals, 453
- Holland*, rev. S. instance of scandalous uses of church property, 517
- House of Peers*, territorial income of, does not exceed three millions, 215
- House of Commons*, defective constitution of, too obvious to require proof, 225; does not represent either property or intelligence, 226; nearly one-half of, returned by 144 peers, *ib.*; calamities of country resulted from constitution of, 227; no national good can be effected without a reform, 229; comparison of its working with that of French chamber of deputies, 230; lord Castlereagh's description of, 231; list of places which formerly sent members, 232; number of elections in each reign, 233; additions to number, 234; alphabetical list of cities and boroughs, right of election, number of voters, and names of patrons, 235; members returned for different sections of the kingdom, 245; statement of parliamentary patronage, 246; prospects of parliamentary reform, 246; reckless mode of legislating in, described, 258; reform of, under the new ministry, 551; analysis of members elected, in 1830, 565
- Household troops*, expenses of, 334
- Howick*, lord, a young man of promise, 454
- Hume*, Mr. his motion on court pension-list, 151; his successful efforts for economy, 327; why not included in the Grey ministry, 449

- Huntingdon*, earl of, seeks a title for a pension to it, 456
- Ireland*, state of, an illustration of good working government, 81; proportion of Catholics and Protestants in, 105; besotted tyranny which has impeded her prosperity hardly creditable to posterity, 114; union benefits the aristocracy but not the industrious orders, 330
- Ireland*, established church of, more pregnant with abuse than English church, 82; acres of land appertaining to sees, 83; mode of leasing bishops' lands, 84; immense wealth of bishops, 85; incomes of parochial clergy, 86; tithe composition-act—its injurious tendency, *ib.*; parishes and glebes, 87; nature and number of unions, 88; sums paid for compositions for tithes with names of incumbents and patrons, 90; proportion of lay and clerical tithes, 94; ministers' money explained, *ib.*; total revenue of, 95; number of clergy, 96; beneficed parochial clergy, only 1075, 97; number of clerical offices 3195, and shared among 850 persons whose average income is £1678, 98; tabular statement of patronage, 99; non-residence of clergy, 100; oppressiveness of tithes illustrated, 102; treatment of Catholics under, 106; first fruits of, how managed, 107; tithes must ultimately fall to Catholic priesthood, unless abolished, 113; digest of benefices from diocesan returns, 115; remarks on, 116; Irish pluralists return on tithe compositions, 539
- Jeffrey*, Francis, lord-advocate, his abilities described, 456
- Jews* may select persons for the Gospel ministry, 19; as numerous in Ireland as Protestants, 102
- Job-persons*, nature of, explained, 65
- Judges* not more independent than other functionaries, 249; laws not understood by them, 252; meet to raise their salaries, 260; salaries of, in 1792 and 1831, 290
- Justices of peace*, improvement required in, 265; better than a stipendiary magistracy, 266
- King's* household, gothic origin of, and expensive establishment, 148
- King*, duties of one, after the old fashion, 170; legal disparity between, and a subject, 268
- King's* printer, remarks on patent of, 484
- Knighton*, sir Wm. the late court favourite, how he may be useful, 458
- Knowledge*, chief instrument of social improvement, 348
- Lancaster*, revenues of county palatine of, 458; a late court favourite receiver of, 459
- Langrishes*, the relatives of a boon companion of the Castle, 459
- Lansdowne*, marquis of, an estimable man, but has said nothing yet about Calne, 459
- Land*, proper subject of taxation, 206
- Laws*, their divisions and origin, 250; may be quoted like the Bible, 251; number of volumes and works comprised in, 253; profusion with which partial have been made in lieu of general, 254; oppressive on middling classes, 255; different in different places, 266; different for different persons, 267; debtor laws, evils from, 263; inconsistent operations of, on property, 272; insecurity of property under, 274; inconsistency in regard to marriage, 275; costs of proceedings, *ib.*; government instituted for administration of, 278; summary of absurdities and abuses in, 279; prospects of legal reform, 286; course which might be adopted to reform, 289; official returns to illustrate, 290
- Lawyers*, their libraries, volumes in, 253; number of, in London and country, 259; most gainful of professions, 260; insolvent laws, chief source of profit to, 262; difference between in this country and on continent, 287
- Lay-impropriations*, origin of, 12; different tenure of, and clerical tithes, 77
- Leases* and conveyances, defects in, 270
- Lectureships*, produce of, 46; mode of paying for, in London, 65
- Leo X.*, curious anecdote of, 286
- Levee* at court—what, 171
- Liber Regalis*; or, King's Book, origin and notice of, 15
- Liturgy* of the church, defects in, 68
- Living*s defined, 503
- Loans*, amount of, in each year, from 1793, 300
- London* clergy, rapacity of, 63; mode of performing their spiritual duties, 65
- Lonsdale*, rev. John, a successful speculator in the crown lands, 123

- Lord-steward* of king's household, his duties, 149; expenditure in his department, 541
- Lord-lieutenant* of Ireland, cost of, 338
- Lord chancellor*, fees received by, 291
- Lushington*, Dr. his opinion controverted that advowsons are like private property, 17; states annual value of see of Canterbury, 43
- Lyndon*, miss, supposed to have been pensioned in the cradle, 463
- Luxmores*, origin of, in the church, 520
- Lyndhurst*, lord, Whigs at a loss how to dispose of him, 462
- Macintosh*, sir James, his character and sinecure appointment, 463
- Madan*, G. his church preferments, 520
- Macauley*, T. B. supposed author of two pamphlets, besides sundry reviews, 464
- Madox*, Mr. history of the exchequer, 330
- Maldon*, elections at, 557
- Manchester*, duchess of, a curious case, 465
- Manuscript* sermons, regular article of sale, 37
- Malborough*, duke of, an instance that true nobility is not hereditary, 465
- Marriage* laws, their defects, 275
- Master* of the horse, his duties, 149; expense of his department, 543
- Master* in chancery, emoluments of, 292. See also *Wingfield*, in *List of Places*.
- Mason*, Mr. his efforts to obtain valuation of first-fruits, 109
- Mavor*, Dr. his spelling-book and preferments, 521
- Milnes*, sir R. S. formerly of the Blues, &c. 467
- Modus*, how set aside by clergy, 65
- Moravians*, most successful missionaries, 48
- Monk*, Dr. bishop of Gloucester, a haberdasher of points and particles, 21
- Mornington*, the countess dowager of, among the state paupers, 467
- Morier*, Mr. charges of his Mexican mission, 184
- Mountcashel*, lord, his statement on non-resident clergy, 36; causes of failure of his motion on the church, 76; curious statements of, 100, 103
- Mulgrave*, countess of, note on her pension, 468
- Nash*, Mr. his dubious conduct, 127
- National debt*, increase of, from aristocratic wars, 295; increase of in each reign since the revolution, 296; begun at the revolution, 304; mode in which reductions in have been effected, 304; summary of progress to 1830, 306; plans for redemption of, 309; new suggestions for liquidating, 318; obligation of on the public, 321; number of persons interested in, 322; forcible reduction of perpetuate power of oligarchy, 323; best ally of reform, 326
- Navy*, abuses in civil department of, 331; return of half-pay of, 540
- Newcastle*, duke of, his lease of crown-lands, 122; his grace's riding-way through Sherwood forest, 123
- Newcastle*, duchess dowager of, note on her pension, 469; her name withdrawn from the court-roll, 501
- Newport*, sir John, his statement of wealth of Irish bishops, 85; his efforts on the first-fruits fund, 108; on an Irish pensioner, 458
- Newspapers*, taxes on, 340; dangerous consequences of monopoly, 341; East-India Company's monopoly not more hurtful, 341; how they might be controlled by government, 342; "The Times" an example of irresponsible power, 343
- Nicholls*, Mr. his valuable recollections of Geo. III. 175
- Non-residence*, statute of Henry VIII. respecting, 503. See *Clergy*.
- Normanby*, lord, ought to take his mother off the pension-list, 468
- Northumberland*, duke of, his income, 213
- Nott*, G. inquiry about from his parishioners, 522
- O'Connell*, Mr. his crucifix in Merrion-square, 55; consequences of his efforts to repeal the Union, 113
- Paley*, Dr. on choice of a national religion, 59
- Parks*, royal, capricious conduct respecting, 127
- Parliamentary* reform under the new Ministry, 551; points it ought to embrace, 564—see *House of Commons*.
- Parnell*, sir H. a doctrinaire, 327; ought to have been included in new ministry, 449
- Parish*, different extent of in north and south, 502; consolidation of, 503; extent of in Ireland, 88
- Patronage* of the church, 17; ought not to be sold and bartered like houses and land, 19; in whom vest-

- ed, 19; applied to political purposes, 21; bishop Sparke's perversion of, 22; archbishop Sutton's do. 23; examples of parochial monopoly, 25; number of individuals and number of preferments held by each in the church of England, 27
- Pay-master* of marines might be abolished, 332
- Pellw*, hon. G. his rapid progress in the church, 523
- Peace* establishments, increase of, 332
- Peel*, sir R. puerile argument on parliamentary reform, 224; specimen of obscure phraseology of one of his acts, 256; probable result of his efforts to reform the laws, 288; his weakness in advising the royal speech, 471; his currency bill defended, 472
- Penn*, origin of pension to the family of, 473
- Pensions*, 392; total amount of £775,556, 401; profligate act for rewarding ministers with, 402; roll of "high and efficient" men called over, 404; to ex-lord chancellors, 405; return of exceeding £1000, 409; £2,161,927 received by 956 individuals; total amount of salaries and pensions £9,457,985, 412; alphabetical list of, 415; concluding remarks on, 500
- Pension-list* useful to advertisers for wives, 458
- Pensioners*, longevity of, instanced, 495
- Phillpotts*, Dr. remarks on his promotion, 523
- Percy*, bishop, his rapid promotion in the church from having married a Sutton, 23
- Political* economists know little of real state of country, 377
- Placemen*, 22,912 in the public offices, 393; plural offices held by, 395; alphabetical list of, 415
- Plunket*, lord, Whigs injured themselves by his elevation, 474; his political character, *ib.*
- Pluralists*, number of, 2,886, 27; absentees at Florence and Paris, 56; alphabetical list of, 502
- Pluralists*, civil and military, 395
- Police*, returns of number and expense of, 546, 548
- Portland*, duke of, his sale of advowson of Mary-le-bone, 125
- Popham*, sir Home, his smuggling voyage, 135
- Popery*, only a religion of "knaves and fools," 4; in temporal matters a more reformed religion than Church of England, 5; more expensive in ceremonies than Protestant, 59
- Poor* livings, returns of, 50; gross imposition respecting, 53
- Prebendary*, an useless order in the church, 29
- Pretymans*, their numerous church preferments, 24; origin of family, 524.
- Price*, Dr. his delusive project for redeeming the debt, 310
- Primogeniture*, origin and utility of, 201 -
- Privy-council*, constitution and duties of, 180; enormous emoluments of, 181; objection to inquire into, answered, 182
- Privy-seal*, lord, duties of, 149
- Privy-purse*, origin and nature of, 151
- Pugh*, John, clerk in chancery, source of emoluments of, 475
- Public* creditor, obligation to keep faith with, 321; distress caused by a breach of faith with, 322; number of, *ib.*; official return of, 545
- Public* charities a source of clerical income, 41; results of inquiry into prove great increase of value of church property, 536
- Public* men not believers in the superstitions of the vulgar, 3
- Puritanism*, fear of falling into extreme of, 78
- Pulteney* family obtained valuable lease of crown lands, 121
- Qualification*, elective, considered, 560
- Quarterly Review*, attempts to controvert fourfold division of tithes, 11; its estimate of church revenues examined, 41
- Queen Ann's* bounty, appropriation of, 61
- Rae*, dame, her pension and claims, 476
- Rennell*, dean, his adventures, 525
- Raynsford*, T. A. registrar in chancery, duties and emoluments of, 476
- Receivers-general*, their emoluments, 451.
- Reformation*, new disposition of ecclesiastical property at, 12; popular hostility to, explained, 13; a similar spirit opposed cow-pox and machinery, *ib.*; the evil of great possessions of individuals aggravated by, 14; number and value of religious houses suppressed, *ib.*; immense value of, proved from state of Ireland, Tuscany, and France, 15

- Regent-street*, cost of improvements in, 126
- Reversions*, nature of, explained, 400
- Richmond*, duke of, remarks on office of, 477
- Ricketts*, Mr. a non-resident consul, 190
- Religion*, conduct of public men in respect of, 2; lost its most objectionable trait by progress of knowledge, 178; men without, seldom better than beasts, 79; not favourable to a free trade in, *ib.*
- Representation*, state of—see *House of commons*.
- Rokeby*, primate, an absentee bishop, 101
- Royalty*, pageantry of, 118; useless trappings, 497
- Russell*, lord John, the flavour of his late speeches not agreeable, 479
- Ryders*, their progress in the church, 526
- St. Paul's school*, abuses in, 527
- St. Vincent*, earl of, his successor no claim to a pension, 479
- St. Mary-le-bone*, sale of advowson of, 125
- Salaries*, enormous increase in, 393; one million per annum might be saved by reduction of, 394; exceeding £1000 return of, 408; classification of 957 placemen and pensioners who receive £2,161,927, 410; total amount of pensions and sinecures, 412
- Settlement of Europe*—what a picture, 333
- Scarlet*, sir James, blunders in forgery act, 257; only a Fig-court lawyer, 426
- Scotch hereditary revenue*, 143
- Scottish church*, economical establishment of, 79
- Scotland*, not England, benefits by the union, 335
- Scott*, sir D. his services at Brighton not merit a pension, 481
- Schomberg*, duke, his heirs receive a pension, 481
- Seymour*, lord Geo. increase in salary of, 480
- Sees*, value of, ought to be equalized, 73; value of, in king's book, 535
- Shauce*, Merrick, pensioned as private secretary, 481
- Shaw*, R. sale of his pension, 481
- Sheridan*, late, pensions to his children, 482
- Short*, C. his great emoluments from fees, 482
- Sidmouth*, lord, alters book of common prayer, 72
- Simony*, laws against, nugatory, 18
- Sinecures*, examples of, 398; total income of, 400
- Sinking-fund*, fallacious principle of, explained, 310; thirty millions lost by, 315
- Sleath*, Dr.—see *St. Paul's School*.
- Slave-trade*, expense of abolition of, 337
- Smith*, lady, sister of the duke, her pension, &c. 483
- Smuggling*, immense expense to prevent, 286; vast extent of, in Ireland, *ib.*
- Society*, classes into which divided, and incomes of each, 216
- Southwark*, strange taste of electors, 495
- Sparke*, bishop, his perversion of patronage to emolument, of his family, 22; origin of family, 528
- Spottiswood*, A. remarks on patent as king's printer, 484
- Stafford*, duke of, his income, 213
- Stanley*, E.G. polled out of Preston, 485
- Stanhope*, lord, puzzles the judges, 252
- Stanhope*, lady, her pension out of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duties, 140
- Stewart*, Dugald, his remark on double doctrine of public men, 3
- Stowell*, lord, his emoluments and his son-in-law, 486
- Suffrage*, principle of, 560
- Sumner*, bishop, a writer of merit, 21; required at Winchester College, 529
- Superannuations*, 396
- Surplice-fees*, produce of, 45.
- Sunk Island*, parochial endowment of, 47
- Sutton*, archbishop, his abuse of church patronage, 23; his principle of church government, 37; cause of first promotion of, 530
- Sermons*, how manufactured, 37
- Suitors'* effects in chancery, amount of, 290
- Taxation*, inequalities of, 207; ditto, 219; more tyranny under than the star-chamber or inquisition, 286; cannot be carried beyond a certain limit, 294; amount of in each year since 1793, 300
- Tea*, prime cost of, in China, and sale price by East-India Company, 368; John Bull finely crucified respecting, between exclusives of Leadenhall and Downing-street, 375

- Thackeray*, Mr. mistaken notion of, on corporate rights of the clergy, 16
- Thomson*, Poulett, a hint to, 487
- Thurlow*, Thomas, remarks on his judicial sinecures, 488
- Tierney*, Mrs. the Whigs ought to have provided for, 488
- Times* newspaper, irresponsible power of, 343
- Tithes*, originated with Adam according to Dr. Cove, 9; neither Judaism nor Christianity sanction them, *ibid.*; introduction of into England, involved in darkness like other points of constitutional history, 10; fourfold division of, proved from existing practice in Ireland, 11; not meant to be abolished, but commuted for an equivalent assessment on landlords, 74; different tenure of lay and clerical, 77; compositions for, in Ireland, 90, 540
- Trafford*, Trafford, a receiver-general of taxes and one of the Manchester magistrates, 489
- Troutback*, the crown appropriates money he left for charitable uses, 144
- Tyburn* or Tartarus, the dread of, necessary to restrain human passions, 3
- Tyton*, A. his extravagant retiring allowance as late solicitor, 490
- Tyrconnel*, earl, his two pensions want explaining, 490
- Union*, effects of a repeal of, 113; effected by lavish grant of pensions, 406
- Unions*, number and nature of, in Ireland, 88
- Universal* suffrage, practical tendency of, 561
- Utterson*, E. V. one of six clerks, emoluments and duties explained, 490
- Visitation* of sick, form of, 71
- Voltaire* may be read with impunity by men of £10,000 a year, 78
- Wakefield*, Mr. his statement on tithe system, 104
- Ward*, Mr. charges of his Columbian mission, 184
- Wastes*, 4000 bills for enclosure of, 254
- Water*, John, his judicial fees, 492
- Watson*, bishop, his ideas on church reform, 75; on selfishness of public men, 175; his replinings and family, 583
- War*, cost of each since the revolution, 296; annual burthen entailed by, 308
- Wellesley*, marquis, seventy-two sons provided for, 494
- Wellington*, duke of, obtains a slice of crown lands to round area of Apsley-house, 127; suggestions to, for reform of chancery, 281; his remark on common law report, 289; letter describing his Indian exploits, 360; his mother among the state paupers, 467; carries the sword of state not without reason, 483; remarks on his political character and the dissolution of his ministry, 492; his skill in posting his piquets, 494
- Wesley*, John, his description of Calvinism, 70
- Westmorland*, lord, crown lands let to him for less than a farthing an acre, 124
- Westmeath*, marchioness of, a way-lay of the field marshal, 494
- Whigs*, strictures on principles of, 173; party character of, under Fox and Burke, 443; neglect of Mrs. Tierney by, 488
- Whiggism* and Toryism defunct superstitions, 173
- Winchester* college, abuses in, 529
- Wilson*, sir R. his aptitude for a gold stick, 495; his puerilities on the ballot, 496
- Winchester*, marquis of, holds a courtly office, 497
- Windsor* cottage, sums expended on, 167
- Wingfield*, W. master in chancery, remarks on duties and emoluments, 496
- Williams*, Mr. trial of, for libel on the clergy, 75
- Williams*, Mr. on abuses in chancery, 280
- Wright*, Mr. secretary to four bishops, his exposure of church discipline, 30
- Wyndham*, hon. P. C. his sinecures in the West Indies, 498
- Wynn*, Mr. his mission to Switzerland and hospitality at the public expense, 184

THE END.



